

All Rights Reserved By HDM For This Digital Publication
Copyright 1993--2003 Holiness Data Ministry

Duplication of this CD by any means is forbidden, and
copies of individual files must be made in accordance with
the restrictions stated in the B4UCopy.txt file on this CD.

Please Note: -- This file is also under the copyright of Warren Haskell, who digitized it.

FUNDAMENTAL CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY -- VOLUME I
A Systematic Theology By Aaron Merritt Hills

Published By C. J. Kinne
Pasadena College
Pasadena, California

* * * * *

Digitized by Warren Haskell
Holiness Data Ministry
Digital Edition 02/06/2003
With The Permission Of Warren Haskell

* * * * *

DEDICATION

To the hundreds of students who have filled my class-rooms and have urged me for these thirty years to write my theology for their use, and for that generation of followers whom they may hereafter teach, this work is lovingly dedicated by the author.

A. M. Hills

* * * * *

FOREWORD

Another Systematic Theology! What courage akin to rashness it required to think of such a thing!
But then,

"There is a Divinity that shapes our ends,
Rough hew them as we will."

Some things we are impelled to do by a power above our own. A Divine hand guides us in our meditation and study. Providence co-operates. Men impress us with an abiding influence. Sixty-four years ago I met the mighty Finney, a king among men, and sat four college years under

his ministry. A mind that he would not stir to the depths would be a marvel of mental lethargy. Associated with him was a faculty of strong independent thinkers, President James A. Fairchild, Dr. John Morgan, Professor of Hebrew, Dr. Henry Cowles, the spiritual commentator, and Dr. Judson Smith, afterward secretary of the American Board of Foreign Missions.

I then went to Yale sixty years ago, and met President Woolsey, just retiring, and President Noah Porter, and Timothy Dwight, the Greek exegete, afterward President, and Dr. George P. Fisher, the noble Church Historian, and Dr. Samuel Harris, Professor of Theology. These men were nobly endowed intellectually, and ranked high in scholarship, and were inspiring to a youth who was ambitious to be a soul-winner.

I began to buy theologies and read critically. Strangely enough all my first theologies were strongly Calvinistic, and that feature of them repelled me. I began to have revivals while yet in college, and I wanted a system of doctrines that were directly calculated to bring salvation to the lost. I was not seeking popularity or big pulpits, but usefulness and men. I wanted a practical Biblical theology that would win souls and not delude them by flattery, nor drive them into infidelity, nor drug them by opiates into a sleep of death.

Born and trained in a Congregational home and nursed by Congregational churches, and educated at Oberlin and Yale, I carried a very distinct stamp. But reading widely in twenty-five authors of systematic theology, an inquisitive, honest and teachable mind might get some new light and some deeper insight into Divine truth. I do not think I ever had a Methodist theology in my hand till I was some years in my first pastorate. But God has His own way of training His teachers. Since then I have owned and used ten Methodist theologies in the class-room teaching earnest inquiring minds who do not think alike. This I have been doing for thirty-three years.

I do not make the slightest claim to originality. I am debtor to everybody. If the reader finds anything excellent in this work, which I am sure he will, let him give all the praise to God, whose Holy Spirit has guided me through the tangled maze of conflicting human speculations to the truth as it is in Christ Jesus, found in the infallible Word of God. I invent no hypotheses, and advocate no fads. My sole aim has been to give the world a theology that wholly glorifies the character of the ever adorable God, and is best calculated to bring lost and sinful men in glad surrender to their blessed Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ.

* * * * *

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.

I. Theology. II. Sources of theology-Nature and Revelation. False sources-Creeds, Tradition, Mysticism, Reason, Christian consciousness, philosophy. III. Theology, can be systematized. IV. The method to be pursued in Systematic Theology.

PART I. -- THEISM

CHAPTER I -- THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

A. Definitions of God. B. Origin of the idea of God. C. Corroborating proofs of theism. I. Ontological argument. II. The Cosmological argument. III. The Teleological argument. IV. The Anthropological argument. 1. Constitution of man as a whole. 2. Argument from the existence of mind. 3. Argument from capacities and wants. 4. Argument from the moral nature.

CHAPTER II -- ANTITHEISTIC THEORIES

I.
II. I. Atheism. II. Pantheism. III. Positivism. IV. Materialism.

CHAPTER III -- ANTITHEISTIC THEORIES, CONCLUDED

V. Secularism. VI. Agnosticism. 1. Lost in their definitions. 2. God can be known.

PART II. -- THEOLOGY

CHAPTER I -- BEING AND PERSONALITY OF GOD

Being of God. Attributes.

CHAPTER II -- DIVINE REVELATION

I. Revelation is necessary. 1. Human reason insufficient. 2. Knowledge of Divine unity lost. 3. Knowledge of God's holiness lost. 4. Religion and morality divorced. 5. Assurance of immortality lost. Man could not discover, 1. The pardon of sin. 2. On what grounds. 3. Whether God would help him. 4. What is his destiny. II. Is a revelation probable? III. Is a supernatural revelation possible?

CHAPTER III -- THEN MIRACLES

I. The shallow sneer at miracles, but not the wise. II. Miracles admit of proof. Hume's argument worthless. Prof. G. P. Fisher's reply. There are false miracles.

CHAPTER IV -- GENUINENESS AND AUTHENTICITY OF SCRIPTURES

I. The Old Testament. Seven evidences. II. The New Testament. Evidence from the fathers. Catalogues of the New Testament books. Different versions. III. The integrity of the Scriptures. I. The Canon.-Made by degrees. Scriptures could not be corrupted.-Variations in readings. Easily explained. IV. The Authenticity of Scriptures. Leslie's four rules. Applied to miracles. Michaelis' tests of a spurious book.

CHAPTER V -- REVELATION AND INSPIRATION

Revelation and Inspiration defined. I. The proof of inspiration. II. The extent of inspiration. Theories of inspiration. Plenary theory. Verbal theory. Essential inspiration. Dynamical theory. Moral inspiration. III. The degree of inspiration. 1. Superintendence. 2. Elevation. 3. Suggestions. 4. Mechanical inspiration. IV. Difficulties and objections. Discrepancies. Inaccurate quotations. Closing remarks.

CHAPTER VI -- AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURES

1. Miracles. 2. Prophecy. Jesus foretold. 3. Internal evidence. 4. Harmony with nature. 5. Remedial. 6. Meets test of Conscience. 7. Teaches perfect morality. 8. Highest inspiration to man. 9. Stimulates faculties. 10. Ennobles man. 11. Restrains him. 12. Redeems. 13. Empowers/ 14. Blessed influence.

CHAPTER VII -- HIGHER CRITICISM

I. Its fountain. II. Its underlying purpose. III. Their methods and ruling hypotheses. Brazen assumption of a monopoly of scholarship. Their disagreements. Pages 148-171.

CHAPTER VIII -- HIGHER CRITICISM, CONTINUED

IV. Results. Infidelity and immorality in schools and in pulpits. Doctrinal results in Germany. Spiritual effects. Germany. England. United States. V. Eight fallacies of the critics. Overthrown by Archaeology. The Bible vindicated against the infidel critics. The most dangerous infidels of all the Christian centuries.

CHAPTER IX -- THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD

Classification. Natural and Moral. Hodge's classification. Miley's. I. Omniscience. Errors. II. Divine sensibility. 1. Holiness. 2. Justice. 3. Love of God. 4. Mercy. 5. Truth. III. Omnipotence.

CHAPTER X -- DIVINE PREDICABLES. NOT DISTINCTLY ATTRIBUTES

I. Eternity. Dr. Charles Hodge, "With God duration is an eternal now." Dr. Miley's "There is no such thing." Wakefield, "Contradicts Scripture." Fairchild: "No finite thought to eternal now." Succession of time is a rational necessity with God as with us. II. Unity of God. The only self-existent One. Whatever the Trinity implies must be consistent with unity of being. Evidence of divine unity. 1. Metaphysical argument. 2. Evidences in creation. 3. No rational requirement of more than one God. III. Omnipresence of God. It means His existence everywhere by His essential being. He fills all space. Everywhere equally present. Miley in a long argument denies: God's personality is confined to one place: only by His knowledge and power He reaches all. 1. The Scriptures and theologians are against Dr. Miley. 2. Wherever God's power creates or works there His essence must be. 3. So of His Providence. "He upholds all things," but is above all. IV. The Immutability of God. This refers to His nature and moral principles. His character will not change. He will govern with the steady hand of unerring wisdom.

CHAPTER XI -- GOD IN TRINITY

I. The Unitarians sneer-"Three Gods". No contradiction between Unity and Trinity. Trinity in Scripture. Trinity in creeds. All divine attributes ascribed to Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Errors respecting trinity. 1. Sabellianism. 2. Arianism. 3. Socinianism. 4. Swedenborgianism. Illustrations of trinity. A. The Son of God. I. Sonship. II. Deity of the Son. 1. Titles. 2. Attributes. 3. Divine works. 4. Worshiped. B. The Holy Spirit. I. Personality. II. Deity of the Spirit. 1. Names. 2. Perfections. 3. Works. 4. Worshiped. Thus a Trinity.

CHAPTER XII -- GOD IN CREATION

I. Theories of Origin of Universe. II. Intelligence in matter. III. Scriptural Doctrine. Immediate and Mediate creation. The Inorganic era. The Organic era. IV. Evolution. 1. Naturalistic evolution. 2. Theistic evolution. 3. Evolution unproved. Evidences against the theory. Biology gives no better support than geology. Everything brings forth after its kind. The gulf of separation between man and animals bridgeless. The greatest scientists against the theory. Virchow calls evolution clubs "Bubble clubs." Haeckel's disgrace.

CHAPTER XIII -- GOD IN PROVIDENCE

1. Affirmed in Bible. 2. Universal. 3. Absolute in matter. 4. Not changeless in matter. 5. Not continuous creation. 6. An inference from power and wisdom of God. 7. Occasionalism. 8. Providence and lower animals. 9. Providence and moral beings. 10. Part of His kingdom not controlled by Omnipotence. Providence and sin. God does not foreordain whatsoever comes to pass. Fairchild's words. 12. Providence and freedom. 13. Implied in personality of God. 14. Infidelity objects to providence.

PART III. -- ANTHROPOLOGY

The Origin of Man: His Fall: Consequent Ruin of the Race.

CHAPTER I -- ORIGIN AND UNITY OF MAN

I. The Origin of Man. Three theories. Miley on evolution. II. Time of Man's origin. 1. Wild speculations of scientists. 2. No necessary conflict with the Bible. Bible genealogy and chronology uncertain. Language variations and race variations. Unity of origin. Effects of climate. 3. Defence of the view. Seven arguments.

CHAPTER II -- PRIMITIVE MAN

I. Genesis story literal. II. Constituent nature of man, Dichotomic and Trichotomic. III. Primitive man constituted as now. Suffering was possible. Perfect memory. IV. Bore the image of God. 1. Intellect. ' 2. Sensibility. 3. Freedom of will. Question is, Is man a free moral agent? Consciousness says, "yes." He 'is free in forming his choice.

CHAPTER III -- MAN'S MORAL AGENCY

I. Schemes of Necessity. 1. Fatalism. 2. Mechanical theory. 3. Materialism. 4. Pantheism. 5. Theory that refers everything to God. 6. Calvinistic doctrine of predestination and divine sovereignty and monergism. 7. The Calvinistic doctrine that choice must be as the strongest motive. II. President Edwards' theory. Edwards' errors. Miley's criticism. Finney's. Edwards' untenable distinctions-Natural ability and moral ability, and natural and moral inability. Natural ability is identical with freedom of the Will. III. Charles Hodge's doctrine. "Man has no power of contrary choice." He must act according to the motives, inclination, character, etc. "It is fixed from all eternity how a man will act." His "certainty" is nothing but necessity and fatalism.

CHAPTER IV -- THE TRUE THEORY OF MORAL FREEDOM

IV. The rational theory. 1. Motive defined. The choice not as the strongest motive. The will determines the motive. 2. Nature of choice. 3. The true freedom. How man may differ from an animal. Power of suspension of choice to have time for reflection. A matter of consciousness that we have power over motive states. This makes a noble life possible. Conscience and moral reason are realities. V. Proofs of free moral agency nine. VI. Irresistible inferences to be drawn. 1. There is no moral inability. 2. The term "gracious ability" a mistake. Finney's strictures. Unanswerable. Daniel Steele's matchless argument. Pages 356-375.

CHAPTER V -- PRIMITIVE HOLINESS AND PROBATION

I. Nature of Adamic holiness. II. Proofs of primitive holiness. Mistakes of both Augustine and Pelagius. III. Elements of primitive holiness. 1. Romish views. 2. True Doctrine. IV. The primitive probation. 1. Natural and reasonable. 2. Complete ability for obedience. 3. Why was SIR permitted? V. The probationary law. VI. The probation fair.

CHAPTER VI -- THE FALL

I. Circumstances of the fall. 1. Agency. 2. The method. 3. The penalty. The kind of death. 4. Race-wide consequence. II. Man free to fall. III. How holy beings sin. IV. Why God permitted the fall. The fall and redemption. V. The fall of angels involved the same principles.

CHAPTER VII -- EFFECT OF THE FALL UPON THE RACE

I. Original Sin. The absurd doctrine of Imputation. Fairchild and Finney on Imputation. Daniel Steele. Leads to Antinomianism. Fletcher's "Creed of Antinomians." Doctrine of Plymouth Brethren. Depravity real. Finney's peculiar view of moral depravity. Depravity defined. Not depravity but men make themselves sinners. Not "born sinners." No such thing as a sinful nature, in the sense of being blameworthy. "The stronghold of Universalism," and of "Calvinism." Summary.

CHAPTER VIII -- PROOFS OF NATIVE DEPRAVITY

1. Scripture. 2. Universal need of justification. 3. Universal need of regeneration. 4. Universal sin. 5. Universal tendency to sin. Efforts to deny depravity. Depravity is not guilt. Guilt defined. 6. Universality of death. 7. Slow progress of gospel agencies. Cheap denial of depravity!

CHAPTER IX -- PHILOSOPHICAL THEORIES ABOUT THE ORIGIN OF DEPRAVITY

I. Supralapsarian Calvinistic Theory. II. Imputation Theory. -III. Sin in pre-existent life. IV. Realistic Mode of Adamic Sin. Reflects on God and mocks reason. "Fooleries!" V. A lower form of realism. VI. The representative mode of Adamic guilt. There was no such Federal Headship. Other strictures. The doctrine against the Convicting work of Spirit.

CHAPTER X -- GENETIC LAW OF DEPRAVITY

I. Definition. 1. Sufficient account of depravity. 2. Sufficiency of the law. 3. Must be the true law. II. Doctrine of native demerit. Arminianism vs. Calvinism. Definitions of actual sin. III. The state of infants. Godbey's prenatal justification, regeneration and sanctification. Baptismal regeneration of babes taught by Augustine--a terrible legacy. All infants saved by Christ. IV. Theological Inconsistencies of Methodist writers.

* * * * *

INTRODUCTION

I. Theology is the greatest study that can occupy human thought. Well it may be. It has the nature of God and His attributes for its theme, and the principles of His government as displayed in His relation to finite moral beings. It necessarily involves a discussion of the nature and character of men and angels.

The term theology suggests as much. It is derived from Theos. God, and logos a discourse. It literally means a discourse about God as related to moral beings and His created universe. The great Hooker said, "Theology, what is it but a science of things divine?"

The very study presupposes a faculty in man which may know God and receive, the knowledge which He imparts of Himself, It has been called "a capacity for religion." Even Voltaire said, "Man is a religious animal."

II. THE SOURCES OF THEOLOGY

1. The two great sources of theology are nature and revelation. They are by no means equal in clearness and fullness. Some great truths we need to know, such as the Trinity, and the Atonement, and how God can forgive sin. These are peculiar to revelation. But the first question of all, theology, the existence of God, must be brought to nature and human reason. The Bible nowhere attempts to prove God's existence, but everywhere assumes it, e. g., Gen. 1:1, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." The Apostle Paul in Romans 1: 19-21, teaches that God is known to the heathen, being revealed by creation, and by the intuitions of their own souls, so that they are left without excuse for their sins. "Religious ideas are everywhere disclosed in human history,-ideas of God or of some supernatural Being, whose providence is ever over mankind, and whom men should worship and obey; ideas of moral obligation and responsibility, of future existence and retribution. These ideas are traceable to the light of nature and rationally traceable to no other source." 1 Miley, Vol. I, p. 9.

Under this light of nature men may so know God and His will as to be morally responsible to Him. The heathen universally admit this to our foreign missionaries. It is upon this ground that retribution is visited upon the Gentile world.

But the Holy Scriptures are the chief source of theology, whole realms of truth which man needed to know for his moral and spiritual well-being, were never discovered even by the most enlightened and thoughtful either of the ancient or modern heathen world. As the Psalmist said, "The entrance of thy Word giveth light." "If tested by the purest moral and religious intuitions, or by the sharpest inquisition of the logical reason, or by the profoundest sense of religious need, or by the satisfaction which its truths bring to the soul, or by its sublime and transforming power in the Spiritual life, the theology of the Scriptures rises infinitely above all other theologies of the world. That they are a direct revelation from God, with the seal of a divine original clearly set upon them, gives to their theology a certainty and sufficiency, a grace and value, specially divine." 1 1. Miley, Vol. I, p. 12.

2. MISTAKEN OR FALSE SOURCES OF THEOLOGY

(1) Creeds or Confessions of Faith.

These are valuable as a historic record of the theological opinions of scholars and divines of the age in which they were formed. They register the opinions of those who formed them on the subjects which they discussed. But they have no authoritative quality: and are in no sense binding upon other men of another age. They cannot, therefore, be regarded as a true source of theology. Some of them are very excellent statements of Christian doctrine, and Bible truth. Others are equally horrible misrepresentations of God, and caricatures of the Gospel of Grace. They must all be tested and measured by the infallible Word of the infinite God.

(2) Tradition.

In Romanism, tradition is held to be co-ordinate with the Scriptures in matters of faith and morals. The Council of Trent decreed: "The sacred and holy, ecumenical and general synod of Trent, following the example of the orthodox fathers, receives and venerates with an equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books, both of the Old and the New Testament; AS ALSO THE SACRED TRADITIONS, as well those pertaining to faith as to morals, . . . and preserved in the Roman Catholic Church by a continuous succession." 2 2. Schaff: "Creeds of Christendom," Vol. II, pp. 79, 80, quoted by Miley

Tradition means anything handed down from person to person. This was of value in the years immediately following Christ's earthly ministry, but what is oft repeated and handed down from generation to generation becomes colored and changed. Innovators came upon the scene of action in the course of the centuries who defended their new doctrines by pretended traditions, "things at variance not only with other traditions, but with the very writings of the Apostles. From this time forward tradition became naturally more and more uncertain and suspicious." 1 1. Knapp: "Christian Theology," p. 39.

To meet Ibis exigency of untrustworthiness, Romanism assumes and claims for itself an abiding inspiration which perpetuates its own infallibility. This abiding inspiration is now held to center in the papacy. This helps to explain how the Roman Catholic Church has developed such a vast body of doctrines and practices utterly unknown to the Scriptures, and often flatly opposed to them.

Some illustrations will be in order. "The first great historical fact inconsistent with this theory is, that the great majority of the bishops, both of the Eastern and Western Church, including the Pope of Rome, taught Arianism, a denial of the Divinity of Christ in the Third Century, which the whole Church, both before and afterward, condemned." "After this defection of the Romish Church in the bishop, Liberius, the whole Roman empire was overspread with Arianism." Then the Church afterward renounced Arianism. Again that Church now teaches errors:

1. It is a monstrous error, contrary to the Bible, to its letter and spirit, and shocking to the common sense of mankind, that the salvation of men should be suspended on their acknowledging the Pope to be the head of the Church in the world or the vicar of Christ. This makes salvation independent of faith or character.

2. Again, it is contrary to the express teachings of the Bible that the Sacraments are the only channels of communicating to men the benefits of redemption. Romanists teach that all who die un-baptized, even infants, are lost.

3. The Church of Rome teaches that the ministers of the Gospel are priests: that the people have no access to God or Christ, and cannot obtain the remission of sins, or other saving blessings, except through their ministrations.

4. The doctrine of the merit of Good Works as they teach it, is a prolific error. They hold that a man may do more than the law requires of him, and perform works of supererogation, and, thus obtain more merit than is necessary for his own salvation. And they hold that this superfluous merit of the saints may be dispensed to others as indulgences.

5. The Roman Catholic Church teaches the doctrine of Purgatory, where believers are perfected, and the sufferings of Purgatory may be lessened or shortened by priests of the church.

6. That Church teaches error concerning the Lord's Supper,- Transubstantiation, or that the priest by a few words of Latin, can transmute the whole substance of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, and the whole Christ, body, soul and divinity, is present in the consecrated wafer, which is to be worshiped as the very Christ. This constitutes the idolatry of the mass, against which John Knox thundered.

7. That Church teaches the idolatrous use of images and the worship of the Virgin Mary, or Mariolatry: also the worship of the saints.¹ 1. Hodge: "Systematic Theology," Vol. I, pp. 144-149.

All these facts conspire to prove that tradition can be no proper source of theology, and that the claim to infallible tradition is a delusion. The Holy Scriptures are the great fountain of truth and the sufficient and only infallible rule of faith and practice.

(3) Mysticism.

Few words have been used in such a vague and indefinite sense as Mysticism. Mystics are those who claim to be under the immediate guidance of God or His Spirit. In the philosophical use of the word, Mysticism includes all those systems of thought which teach either the identity of God and the soul (a form of Pantheism) or the immediate intuition of the infinite.

In a still wider use of the word, any system of thought, whether in philosophy or religion, which ascribes more importance to the feelings than to the intellect, is mystical. "Reason is no longer viewed as the great organ of truth. Its decisions are regarded as well-nigh worthless, while the inward impulses are held up as the true and infallible source of human knowledge. The fundamental process, therefore, of all Mysticism is to reverse the true order of nature and give the precedence to the emotional instead of the intellectual element of the human mind. This is the common ground of all Mysticism." 2. Morell: "History of Modern Philosophy," p. 556.

It holds that God may be known face to face, and that we attain directly, without the aid of the senses or reason, by an immediate intuition of God, the real and absolute principle of all truth. It therefore, naturally tends to mistake for a divine manifestation the operation of a merely human faculty.

The Mystics easily become imbued with the notion that they receive an immediate communication of divine knowledge from God to the soul independently of the Scriptures, or the use of any ordinary means of Grace.

It will be readily seen that this differs essentially from the Scriptural doctrine of divine illumination as held by all evangelical Christians. The Scriptures teach that the Holy Spirit takes truth already made known in the Bible, and makes it real to our minds by quickening in us a spiritual discernment of its meaning. The Mystics, on the other hand, claim a revelation of truth quite apart from the Bible, and the use of any means of grace, and, indeed, by an utter neglect of them.

But God gives no promise of such revelations which shall supersede the Scriptures, or bring higher truth to the soul. As a matter of fact, while some Mystics have been blessed examples of a pure and elevated Christian life, like Tauler, Boehm, Fenelon, Madame Guyon and Thomas a Kempis, and some blessed Friends, eminent for piety, yet, through the Christian centuries, from Montanus of the Second Century till now, the system of thought has developed or tended to a rashness and arrogance of Spirit which easily ran into evil excesses of conduct and wild and reckless fanaticism.¹ In places it well-nigh wrecked the Protestant Reformation under Luther. It has led many Quakers into great errors of doctrine. Some explicitly denied the authority ~of Scriptures, and the doctrine of the Trinity and the Atonement. Some ignored the historical Christ altogether. The Scriptures were only "to be a secondary rule subordinate to the Spirit."

1. Miley's Theology, Vol. I, p. 18.16

Romanists, while admitting the infallibility of the Bible, still contend that it is not sufficient; and hold that God's Spirit continues to make revelations to the leaders of the Church.

Mystics, making the same admission concerning the worth of the Bible, claim that the Spirit is given to every man, whose instructions and influence are the highest rule of faith, and sufficient, even without the Scriptures, for the Salvation of the Soul.

The following objections may be urged alike against both these theories:

1. There is no warrant for such notions in the Scriptures. The Word is sufficient, and we are warned against adding to, or taking from, its precepts and doctrines, as men are continually doing who accept the theories under consideration.

2. The doctrine in question is Contrary to Scriptures. It is opposed to God's uniform method and plan of guiding His people. Everywhere and always, He has delivered His truth through chosen and authenticated messengers, "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." And from their "thus saith the Lord" there was no appeal. "To the Law and to the testimony: "If they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them." Isaiah 8: 20.

3. The assumption of Mystics is contrary to universal facts. Without the revealed Word of God men live in darkness, "without hope and without God," in great ignorance of moral and spiritual truth. What the sun is to the natural world, the Bible is to the moral and spiritual nature of mankind. Where the Bible has not gone, and where it is not loved and trusted, and believingly read, there is a moral "darkness that may be felt."

4. The Mystical theory affords no test or criterion to measure these inward impulses. The Devil can speak to us, as well as the Holy Spirit, and often does, feigning to be the Spirit of God, as all fanaticism proves. No strength of conviction affords any assurance to its possessor that it is from God. It must be tested by the Holy Word. To tell men, who have carnal hearts, and to whom Satan has access, to follow their inner impressions and spiritual convictions, is to offer them a sure guide to darkness and death.

5. Mysticism has ever been a source of evil. Under its influence, men have neglected divine ordinances, set aside plainly revealed doctrines of the Holy Word, ignored the Church, the ministry, the sacraments, the Scriptures, and have run after the wildest vagaries of opinion and fanatical excesses of conduct. Manifestly, Mysticism is no true source of Theology. 1, Hodge: "Systematic Theology," Vol. I, pp. 98-103

(4) Reason is not an Independent and Adequate Source of Theology. Nor do we, in saying this, belittle the service of reason in matters of religion. It has a most responsible service to perform in all that concerns faith.

A. "In the first place, reason is presupposed in every revelation. Revelation is the communication of truth to the mind. But this presupposes a capacity to receive the truth. Revelations are not made to stones or beasts of the field. Truths to be accepted must be apprehended. A proposition to which no meaning can be attached cannot be an article of faith. In other words, knowledge is essential to faith.

B. "In the second place, it is the prerogative of reason to judge of the credibility of a revelation. The credible is that which can be believed. Nothing is incredible but the impossible. What may be, may be rationally believed. A thing may be strange, unaccountable, unintelligible and yet perfectly credible.

"Christians concede to reason the prerogative of deciding whether a thing is possible or impossible. If it is seen to be impossible, no authority, and no amount or kind of evidence can impose the obligation to receive it as true."

"What is Impossible?"

(a) What involves a contradiction is impossible, as that right is wrong and wrong is right.

(b) It is impossible that God should do or approve what is morally wrong.

(c) It is impossible that He should require us to believe what contradicts any of the laws of belief which He has impressed upon our nature.

(d) It is impossible that one truth should contradict another. It is impossible, therefore, that God should reveal anything as true which contradicts any well authenticated truth, whether of intuition, experience, or previous revelation." 1. Hodge: "Systematic Theology," Vol. 1, pp. 49-53.

C. "Reason must judge of the Evidence of a Revelation. We may remark here:

1. Faith involves assent, and assent is conviction produced by evidence. It follows that faith without evidence is either irrational or impossible.

2. This evidence must be appropriate to the nature of the truth believed. Historical truth requires historical evidence: empirical truths, the testimony of experience: mathematical truths, mathematical evidence; moral truth, moral evidence: and "the things of the Spirit," the demonstration of the Spirit.

3. Evidence must not only be appropriate but adequate. The Scriptures never demand faith except on the ground of adequate evidence. Faith is not a blind irrational assent, but an intelligent reception of truth on adequate grounds. It is the prerogative of reason to judge of all these things."

In the same vein, Richard Watson defends the use of Reason in religion: "Many pious men think it presumptuous to apply reason in any way to the revelations of God. They think it safer to resign their minds to devout impressions, than to exercise their understandings in any speculations upon sacred subjects.

Enthusiasts and fanatics of all names and sects agree in decrying the use of reason, because it is the very essence of fanaticism to substitute, in the place of the sober deductions of reason, the extravagant fancies of a disordered imagination, and to consider these fancies as the immediate illumination of the Spirit of God.

The Church of Rome, in order to subject her votaries to her authority, has reprobated the use of reason in matters of religion. She has held that things may be true in theology which are false in philosophy, and has in some cases, made the merit of faith to consist in the absurdity of that which was believed.

1. The first use of reason in matters of religion is to examine the evidences of revelation.
2. It must decide what are the truths revealed. They are not communicated by immediate inspiration. The knowledge must be acquired by a reverent candid study of the Word.
3. Reason is of eminent use in repelling the attacks on Christianity.
4. The fourth use of reason consists in judging of the truths of religion, and weighing the doctrines that others draw from the Bible. Nothing can be received by us as true which is contrary to the dictates of reason, because it is impossible for us at the same time to receive the truth and the falsity of a proposition. Many things are true which we do not fully comprehend: and many propositions appear incredible which further examination proves to be true.

These are the steps by which reason proceeds.

- (1) We examine the evidences of revelation. If these satisfy our understanding, we are certain that there can be no contradiction between the doctrines of this true religion and the dictates of right reason.
- (2) If any such contradiction appears there must be a mistake in the interpretation of the Gospel. We suppose it contains doctrines which it does not teach. Or we give the name of right reason to some narrow prejudice, which deeper reflection and enlarged knowledge will dissipate.
- (3) One of the most important offices of reason is to recognize her own limits: but she never can be moved, by any authority, to receive as true what she perceives to be absurd." 1. Watson: "Dictionary of Religious Knowledge."

In a conversation with the writer in his own study, Dr. Josiah Strong once said: "I believe that what is true is reasonable, and what is reasonable is true." There is a world of truth in this brief sentence. Every reverent, spiritual mind, with the Bible in his hands, is profoundly impressed with the sweet reasonableness of its doctrines and revelations of truth. .

D. The steps by which Reason marches to the conquest of theological truth seem to be the following:

1. Since reason is the intuitive faculty or function of the intellect, it gives the primary or essential truths of the soul: such as the existence of God-an immediate datum or intuitive truth of the reason, the absolute-for example, right and wrong; the necessary- space exists; the infinite-space is infinite; the perfect-God is perfect; moral law and the sense of obligation to obey God.1 All nations believe in God and that He is a personal Moral Governor to whom they are responsible. The idea seems to be as universal as mind itself. 1. Finney, pp. 13-70, and Miley, Vol. I, p. 40.

2. On the ground of a personal God, reason decides that a divine revelation is rationally probable. God, it decides, must be benevolently concerned for our well-being. As an infinitely wise and good Father he must have a concern for the moral and spiritual well-being of His children.

3. Reason decides that the highest moral and religious truth is profoundly important. The importance of such a revelation is enhanced by the supreme interests of the soul that are at stake. Human destiny is involved.

4. Reason affirms that the highest certainty of religious truth is supremely desirable. The uncertainties and disagreements of human speculation cannot meet the needs of man. We need truth as God knows it, and not as man guesses about it. The history of mankind reveals a craving for certainties in religion.

5. Reason decides that we can have no such truth as the world needs and craves, without a divine revelation. The history of human thought proves that apart from the Bible, or on a denial of its divine origin, there never has been certain knowledge about God and ourselves as moral beings in sin and on the way to the judgment. Therefore a revelation is a rational probability.

6. Reason decides that such a revelation is possible only through a supernatural agency of God. The manifestations of religious truth revealed by nature and the moral constitution of man are indeed helpful and efficient; but they are not sufficient. There are truths of Christianity of which nature gives no hint and the intuitions do not speak. We need to know them. They were never discovered by the unaided mind of man and could never have been known, save as God revealed them. Such are the doctrines of the Trinity, the doctrines of sin in its origin and consequences, the divine Incarnation, the personality of Christ, the Atonement, Justification by faith, the work of the Holy Spirit in Sanctification. These immeasurably important truths have come to us only as a direct communication from God.

7. Reason declares that such a stupendous revelation must be supernaturally attested. Hence the necessity of miracles. Miracles are the appropriate credentials of God's messengers and the proof that a declared revelation is really from God. Thus a miracle may be defined as "a supernatural event wrought by God to accredit some messenger as divinely commissioned, or some truth as divinely given." It is not always anti-natural but it is usually supra-natural—an event out of the ordinary course of nature, and sometimes involving a temporary suspension of nature's laws.

8. After such a body of truth has been revealed, it is the province of reason to construct the revelations and truths into a scientific system.¹ God himself submits His revelations and His own character and conduct to the investigation of human reason. "Come now and let us reason together, saith the Lord" (Isa. 1: 18). 1. Miley's Theology, Vol. I, pp. 30-33.

After thus admitting the noble use of reason in determining the contents of theology, let it be remembered, that it may be perverted and misused. This is the chief peril of present day theology, and higher criticism. **IT HAS OFTEN DEGENERATED, AND CONSTANTLY TENDS, TO RATIONALISM AND BALD INFIDELITY.** "Rationalism, in religion, as opposed to supernaturalism means the adoption of reason as our sufficient and only guide, exclusive of

tradition and revelation-such rationalism leads to the elimination of all the vital truths of Christian Theology."

We have said that reason had her own limits. She can apprehend truths when revealed which she cannot comprehend or fully explain. There is a vast difference between knowing and understanding or fully comprehending. The wisest electricians cannot tell us what electricity is. But Morse and Field and Edison can invent ways of using it and even we have sense enough to permit it to haul us about the city in the street car, or to pull the lever and light our chamber, and use it to send our messages half across America and across the Atlantic to England.

A group of new theologians and higher critics, could stand beside a clover field where a drove of hogs, a flock of sheep,- a flock of geese and a herd of cattle are feeding. They could not all of them tell, after a day of consultation, why, eating the same clover, the hogs grow bristles, the sheep grow wool, the geese grow feathers, and the cattle grow hair. Yet they will go to their homes and feed on ham and mutton and beefsteak and baked goose, and lie down to sleep on hair mattresses, and pillow their heads on feathers, and rise in the morning and brush their bald heads with bristles, and clothe themselves with woolen raiment, and then coolly decide to reject the great doctrines of revelation, the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Divine-human nature of Christ, the Super-natural birth and resurrection of Jesus, the Miracles and the Inspiration of Scriptures, because these truths are contrary to their settled convictions or prejudices, their preconceptions or feelings, or because they cannot wholly understand and comprehend them.

We will quote a single illustration from a man with whom we were once a guest at a dinner table. "Rationalism is the antitheses of all systems of thought which depend on authority as the source of truth. Modern thinkers reject the strictly miraculous everywhere. Hence they reject the authority of the Scriptures. The doctrine of the Incarnation is totally unintelligible, no theologian having yet succeeded in putting any intelligent meaning into the proposition that in Christ is found two natures, divine and human. With the incarnation will also disappear the doctrine of the Trinity and the Atonement."

Such an assertion from the pen of a so-called Christian minister, can only come from a carnal, wicked heart that is abusing and perverting reason, and leading him into a fathomless and shoreless sea of infidelity. German rationalism is the theological peril of the hour, from which few of our prominent schools wholly escape. It is manifest from the above that human reason is not an independent and adequate source of theology.

(5) Christian Consciousness is not an independent source of Theology.

Consciousness is the mind in the act of knowing itself. Van Oosterzee tells us that chiefly through the influence of Schleier-macker in the last century, Christian Consciousness began to be considered a source of dogmas or doctrines. It is a phrase to designate the pious feeling which a believer or community of believers finds in his heart relative to some doctrine. About fifty years ago the religious press was full of discussion of this subject. Men would say, "My Christian Consciousness forbids me to believe this and that, and the other doctrine of Scripture."

But this theory which makes religious feeling the source of theology, is a strange reversal of true order of thought, and puts the effect above and prior to the cause. It was the mental apprehension of the revealed truths of the Gospel which men have put in practice that developed the refined feelings and tender sentiments of men. And shall men now kick down the ladder by which they have climbed, and let their feelings reject or determine the contents of the doctrines? Shall sentimental feelings now determine what truths are to be rejected and what received? It is unscientific.

Besides the Christian Consciousness varies in different times, and in different communions. A Protestant shudders at the idolatry of the mass and the images; but these awaken devout emotions in the breast of the Roman Catholic. There are different views of God and man, duty and destiny, and they severally develop a form of consciousness in accord with the doctrines held. It is manifest, therefore, that Christian Consciousness is no safe and reliable and adequate source of Christian doctrine, and a sound theology. We must first have the great revealed doctrines of sin and redemption, and God's method of salvation, before any Christian Consciousness can exist.

(6) Human Philosophy is not an adequate source of Theology.

Philosophy has been defined as "the attainment of truth by the way of reason." Philosophy and theology therefore occupy common ground. Both assume to teach what is true concerning God, man and the world, and the relation which God sustains to His creatures. But their methods are fundamentally different. Philosophy seeks to attain knowledge and arrive at its conclusions by speculation, simply by the use of our mental powers. Theology, on the other hand, relies on authority, receiving as truth what God in His Word has revealed.

Both these methods are legitimate. God is the author both of the Bible and that older Bible—the book of nature. He is the maker of heaven and earth. He does not contradict Himself. Therefore both Books when rightly interpreted will agree. The laws of nature and the real facts of the external world will agree with the Book Divine. Dr. Hodge well says: "Philosophers should not ignore the teachings of the Bible, and theologians should not ignore the teachings of science. Much less should either class needlessly come into collision with the other. It is unreasonable and irreligious for philosophers to adopt and teach theories inconsistent with the facts of the Bible, when these theories are only sustained by plausible evidence, which does not command the assent even of the body of scientific men themselves.

On the other hand, it is unwise for theologians to insist on an interpretation of Scripture which brings it into collision with the real facts of science. Both of these mistakes are often made."1 Many naturalists and evolutionists have contradicted Scripture as to the single origin of the human race as we shall see, against the protests of their own scientific brethren. Theologians, on the other hand, foolishly opposed the adoption of the Copernican theory of our solar system. Such contradictions are extremely unwise. Facts cannot contradict God, who made the facts. But we must have the FACTS and not UNSUPPORTED THEORIES AND GUESSES. 1. Hodge: Systematic Theology, Vol. I, p. 51.

"Philosophy, in its widest sense, being the conclusions of the human intelligence, as to what is true, and the Bible being the declarations of God as to what is true, it is plain that where the two

contradict each other, philosophy must yield to revelation; man must yield to God. What is the philosophy of the Orientals, of Brahmins and Buddhists, of the early Gnostics, of the Platonists, of the Scotists in the Middle ages, of Leibnitz with his Monads and pre-established harmony; of Des Cartes and his vortices; of Kant and his Categories; of Fichte, Schelling and Hegel with their different theories of idealistic pantheism? These are simply so many forms of human speculation. So far as they agree with the Bible they are true; and so far as they differ from it, they are false and worthless."1 Hodge: Systematic Theology, Vol. I, pp. 58, 59.

The Bible teaches that God creates, and governs, and controls, in human history. Any philosophy that denies that He can act in time, and relegates Him back into a past eternity, is false. Human philosophies are a tangled wilderness of conflicting opinions. "The wisdom of man is foolishness with God," and it is no reliable and adequate source of theology.

III. THEOLOGY CAN BE SYSTEMATIZED.

Just as the facts of the animal kingdom can be arranged into a system, or science, so can the facts of theology. There is a sufficient certainty to the facts, and the theologian has a right to arrange the truths revealed into an orderly science, or a system of doctrines. There is an inter-relation between the various doctrines which needs to be exhibited. People not only need to know truths, but also to know them in their relations to each other.

Objections have been made to a systemization of theological truths. It is said: "Religion is a life and not a doctrine." There is truth in this. True religion is a right state of the heart and life, more than it is a set of opinions.

But the fact is, there is a vital connection between the doctrines and the life. A religious movement, with power to lift up souls and reform communities and leaven nations, must have its inception and progress in a body of Gospel doctrines that glorify Jesus and His Atonement as the only hope of the world. Unitarian-ism can produce no such results. Compare the influence of Wesleyan doctrines in England and America with the influence of Roman Catholic doctrines in Spain or Ireland or anywhere on earth. Why should we repent of sins? Why should we be born of the Spirit? Why did Jesus die for us? Why is faith in Him necessary to salvation? Why should we be sanctified, and how? The answer to such questions involve and call out a great system of doctrines. Again, it is argued that the systematizing of the doctrines of theology leads to bigotry and strife.

This is not a necessity. The greatest of theologians have been sweet-spirited and free from bigotry. But when these doctrines are embraced in a living faith, there is necessarily a profound sense of their importance. They should be held with tenacity, and defended with earnestness. God even commands us to "contend earnestly for the faith, once delivered unto the saints."1 The possession of truth is incomparably more important than any false peace. There is nothing more withering and subtly dangerous than an easy-going, indifferent, "go-as-you-please" and "believe-what-you-will" liberalism, that derides all serious convictions of faith, and all conscientiousness of life. And oftentimes the most illiberal and bigoted element of human thought is the much-vaunted liberalism. The strings of its bows are incessantly vibrant, and the air is sulphurous from the fiery darts it is perpetually shooting at the orthodox faith in a divine, atoning Savior. 1.1 Jude 3

There is as much bigotry of negation, as there is of affirmation. Man ought to have a positive belief for rest to his soul.

IV. THE METHOD TO BE PURSUED IN SYSTEMATIZING THEOLOGY

We might name many systems and methods of discussing Christian doctrine. Dr. Charles Hodge divided his great Systematic Theology as follows:

"Part I. Theology Proper-the doctrine of God.

Part II. Anthropology-The Nature of Man.

Part III. Soteriology-God's Plan of Salvation.

Part IV. Eschatology-The Doctrine of Last Things."

Dr. Miley in his noble theology gives the following divisions:

"Part I. Theism: The Existence of a Personal God, Creator Preserver and Ruler of All Things.

Part II. Theology: The Attributes of God; the Trinity.

Part III. Anthropology: The Origin of Man, his Fall, and the Consequent Ruin of the Race.

Part IV. Christology: The Incarnation of the Son: the person of Christ.

Part V. Soteriology: The Atonement and Salvation in Christ.

Part VI. Eschatology: The Intermediate State: the Second Advent; the Resurrection; the Judgment, and the Final Destinies."

We shall closely follow this latter order in our discussions.

* * * * *

PART I -- THEISM

CHAPTER I -- THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

All men believe in the existence of God. The conviction that there is a superhuman Being on whom they are dependent, and to whom they are responsible is as wide-spread as the race. What is the origin of this idea? What produces a belief so universal? And what is this Being in whose existence the human family has such a wide spread faith?

A. Definition of God.

1. Aristotle defined God, as: "The first ground of all being; the divine spirit which, unmoved itself, moves all."

2. Hegel's definition: "The Absolute Spirit; the pure, essential Being that makes Himself object to Himself; absolute holiness; absolute power, wisdom, goodness, justice."

3. Kant: "A Being who by His understanding and will is the cause, (and by consequence the Author) of nature; a Being who has all rights and no duties (NOT TRUE); the supreme perfection

in substance, the all-obligating Being; Author of a universe under moral law; the moral Author of the world; an intelligence infinite in every respect."

4. Westminster Confession: "God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth."

Dr. Hodge thinks this the best definition ever penned by man. Dr. Miley thinks, "Personality is the deepest truth in the conception of God, and with this should be combined the perfection of his personal attributes." 1. Miley's Theology, Vol. I, pp. 59, 60.

Hence,

5. Miley's definition: "God is an eternal personal Being, of absolute knowledge, power and goodness"

Many more definitions might be given. These are sufficient to cover the field of thought, except some infidel theories to be discussed hereafter.

B. Origin of the Idea of God.

Intuition. The existence of God is an innate conviction of the soul. It is one of the primary and necessary ideas of the moral reason which affirms in every breast. **THERE IS A GOD AND I AM RESPONSIBLE TO HIM.** The existence of this belief seems to be universal and necessary. Like the idea of right and wrong, of space, and time, and the perfect; the axioms of geometry, and the idea of moral obligation, it seems to be a part of the natural equipment of the minds of men.

God never seems to try to prove His existence to us. The Bible always assumes that men know that there is a God and that they are the subjects of His moral government. There is no satisfactory way of accounting for this universal belief, except that such a belief is founded on the very constitution of our nature, a part of the essential make up of the mind.

It is objected that some disbelieve in God's existence and our accountability to Him.-The eye was manifestly made for light; but one can voluntarily make his eye diseased and blind. So, "speculative atheism, through a perversity of the feelings of the mind, may be so blinded as not to see the most certain moral truths, or so prejudiced as openly to deny them. But the same philosophy that denies the intuition of God also denies all other intuitive truths. Therefore neither the possibility nor the actuality of instances of speculative atheism can in the least discredit the truth that the idea of God is an intuition of the moral reason." 1. Miley: Theology, Vol. I, p. 64.

Again, it is objected that some heathen tribes are without a knowledge of God. But the keenest scientific observers deny that there are any such tribes. The careless reports of sightseers and adventurers have been discredited.² Moreover, if such a heathen tribe should be found, it might only prove that, like infants, they were not sufficiently developed to recognize their own moral intuitions. But the real proofs of the existence of such people are still wanting. Muller says: "We may safely say that, in spite of all researches, no human beings have been found anywhere who do not possess something which to them is religion; or, to put it in the most general form, a belief in

something beyond what they can see with their eyes."3 2. John Paton's testimony of the Aborigines of Australia. 3. Miller: Origin of Religion, p. 76.

Mueller cites Professor Tiele: "The statement that there are nations or tribes which possess no religion rests either on inaccurate observations, or on a confusion of ideas. No tribe or nation has yet been met with destitute of belief in any higher being, and travelers who asserted their existence have afterward been refuted by facts. It is legitimate, therefore, to call religion in its most general sense, A UNIVERSAL PHENOMENON OF HUMANITY."4 4. Outlines of The History of Religion, p. 6.

Again evolutionists and the higher critics would find in fetichism the primitive religion, or at least some form of idolatry. But the facts of religious history forbid it. These facts point to primitive monotheism. The doctrine of St. Paul is fully vindicated that idolatry is born of religious degeneration from a knowledge of the true God.1 1. Miley, Vol. 1, p. 67.

"The universality of the idea of God means its NECESSITY, or that under the proper conditions it is SPONTANEOUS to the moral and religious constitution of the mind. Some would have us believe that the universality of the belief is accounted for by tradition. But man is depraved and "does not like to retain the knowledge of God in his heart." Were not the idea of God native to the human mind this antagonism, of the sensibilities, strengthened by vicious habits, would long ago have led most races to its utter abandonment. It is the innateness of the idea that has perpetuated it in human thought and feeling." Nothing else can account for its persistence and universality.

And it is to this that God always appeals in His other revelations. There must of necessity be something in man that can respond to the truth which God would reveal when He says, "Thus saith the Lord."

Conclusion. Our intuitions must give us objective truth. No mental faculty can be more trustworthy than the intuitive. If our intuitions are not truths, no results of our mental processes can be trusted. Our sense-perceptions can have no warrant of truthfulness. Men have found themselves mistaken in all their interpretation of sense-perceptions, and in mental processes, while no intuition has ever been found untrue. The idea of God is wrought into the very nature of man. Is it a delusion? It cannot be. Man is not so formed. His mental faculties are trustworthy, and he is capable of knowledge. The intuitions of his reason are absolute truths. Therefore, THE INTUITION OF GOD IN THE MORAL REASON OF THE RACE PROVES HIS EXISTENCE! 22. Miley, Vol. I, pp. 71, 72

C. Corroborating Proofs of Theism.

I. THE ONTOLOGICAL ARGUMENT.

The Ontological Argument for the existence of God, is made from the nature of being.

a. What kind of Being can subsist by himself independent of all other beings?

b. A secondary form of the argument is the proof based upon fact or nature of the idea of God as it exists in the human mind. It is an a priori argument akin to the argument from intuition. It is designed to show that the real objective existence of God is involved in the very idea of such a Being. It is commonly made to include all arguments which are not a posteriori; that is, which do not proceed from effect to cause.

(1) St. Augustine, taking a hint from Plato argued from the existence of a finite and imperfect human truth and reason, that perfect truth and reason must exist somewhere by which it can be measured.¹ 1. Webster's Dictionary, 1910 edition.

(2) Anselm argued thus: "We have an idea of an infinitely perfect Being; but actual existence is included in infinite perfection. Because, if actual existence be a perfection, and God is not actually existent then we can conceive of a being greater than God. An imaginary or ideal being however perfect in conception, cannot answer to the idea of the most perfect. Hence, we must admit the actual existence, for only so can we have the idea of the most perfect Being. This most perfect Being is God. Therefore, God must exist."² 2. Hodge, Vol. I, p. 205.

(3) Argument of Des Cartes: "I find in me the notion of God which I cannot have formed by my own power, since it involves a higher degree of Being than I possess. It must have for its author God Himself, who stamped it upon my mind, just as an architect impresses his stamp on his work. God's existence also follows from the very idea of God, since the essence of God involves existence- eternal and necessary existence."³ 3. Miley, Vol. I, p. 74.

(4) Dr. Samuel Clarke argued as follows:

1. Something has existed from eternity. As something now is, something always was; for otherwise, present things must have been produced from nothing, which is absolutely impossible.

2. There has existed from eternity some one unchangeable, independent Being; for, otherwise, there must have been an eternal succession of changeable and dependent beings which is contradictory and absurd.

3. The independent unchangeable eternal Being must be self-existent, or exist necessarily. This necessity must be absolute, as originally in the nature of the thing itself.⁴ 4. Miley, Vol. I, p. 75

(5) Kant's argument: Necessary existence is the only ground of possible existence; therefore some being must necessarily exist. The necessary Being is single; is simple; is immutable and eternal; is the supreme reality; is a Spirit; is God."¹ 1. Miley, Vol. I, p. 76.

The worth of these arguments depends on the aptness of the mind who reads them for metaphysical discussion. To some they are the strongest of all arguments for the existence of God. To others they have much less value.

II. THE COSMOLOGICAL ARGUMENT.

This is an argument for the existence of God, the basis of which is the necessity of inferring an Infinite Being as the only rational cause of the world-Cosmos.

Stated as a syllogism, the argument stands thus: Every effect must have an adequate cause- The world is an effect. Therefore, the world must have had a cause outside of itself, and adequate to account for its existence.

The worth of this argument depends on the truth of three things: 1. The principle of causation; 2. the dependence of the Cosmos upon a Creator; 3. the inadequacy of the forces of nature to its formation.

1. The doctrine of Causation.

It is the doctrine or law of causation that every phenomenon or event must have a cause. This cause must be something—a real existence that has adequate power or efficiency, appropriate to the effect, and that to which the effect is due. But this is one of the primal, intuitive truths of reason. It is self-evident and needs no proof, the contrary of which one cannot rationally think. Every man in the right use of his reason affirms it. It is futile to even attempt to empty the mind of the principle of efficient causation.

This idea of cause to be complete must demand that the cause be original, back of which there was no preceding cause,

As nothing could never produce something, there must have been eternal being. The idea of adequate causation applied to the world and the universe leads us logically and inevitably to an Eternal, Original, Self-existent Being.

2. The dependence of the Cosmos. The world shows that everything in it is dependent and mutable, and as a whole it cannot be self-existent and eternal. Man was but a creature of yesterday. Geologists point us to the azoic rocks in which there was no life. All of vegetable and of animal life is of modern origin. Neither experience nor science, neither fact nor reason, justify the assumption of spontaneous generation. And when life is started, genera and species are permanent. Now man, animals, plants, rocks, all had a beginning. They all began to be. "Who made all these?" said Napoleon Bonaparte. "Who laid the foundations of the earth, and covered it with beauty and life? Who spread the heavens above it as a curtain? Who created the hosts of heaven, and leadeth them out, and knoweth their number?"

These things all began to be. A beginning is an event which had a cause. They, therefore, had a creator. He must be an infinite God.

3. The forces of nature are utterly inadequate to produce the world. The cosmos is too vast and complex and wonderful for us to believe that it was produced by blind force. Mill, arguing this question against the evidence of a God, talks glibly about "the eternity of matter and force, the conservation of energy, the eternal sameness of force in quantity." He says: "There is in nature a permanent element and also a changeable: the changes are always the effect of previous changes; the permanent existences, so far as we know, are not effects at all." "There is in every object

another and a permanent element, namely, the specific elementary substance or substances of which it consists and their inherent properties. These are not known to us as beginning to exist: within the range of knowledge they had no beginning, consequently no cause; though they themselves are causes or con-causes of everything, that takes place." "Whenever a physical phenomenon is traced to its cause, that cause when analyzed is found to be a certain quantum of Force, combined with certain collocations. There exists in nature a fixed quantity of force which is never increased or diminished. Here then we find, even in the changes of material nature; a permanent element; to all appearance the very one of which we were in quest. This it is, apparently, to which, if to anything, we must assign the character of First Cause, the cause of the material universe."¹ 1. Mill's "Three Essays on Religion," pp. 142-154.

All this sounds very brave and smart. It is so much nobler to say that "within the range of our knowledge Force never had a beginning; therefore it never had a cause; therefore we will spell it with a capital letter, and try to believe that Force and certain collocations, made the material universe, than to admit that there is a God."

But it will be noticed that his argument is founded on the baseless assumption of the eternity of matter, because his matter and Force could not come from nothing. It is an intuitive and necessary truth that every effect must have a cause and that *ex nihilo nihil fit*—out of nothing nothing comes. His theory cannot bear the tests of reason.

a. How is this world constructed by the operation of blind, unthinking force? He says there is a long succession of changes. "The changes are always the effects of previous changes." This runs us into the old unthinkable and self-contradictory absurdity of an endless chain of causes with no first link and hanging upon nothing!

b. But the world bears all the marks of being a new, and lately made world. If matter and "Force" made it and they are eternal, why did not the world come into being an eternity earlier than it did? Or was the "Force" eternally quiescent before it began to make the world? If so, what aroused it and started it in motion and guided it in its cosmical work?

c. Perhaps this eternally active "Force" was doing something else for countless ages before it began to make the world, or it did not "combine with certain collocations." Why didn't it? Why did it abandon its previous job? How could blind force move out upon a new line of operation?

d. Inertia is one of the unquestionable laws or qualities of matter. All activity of physical "Force" is conditioned on the proper conjunction or collocation of material elements. But matter being inert, how could the peculiar collocation of it ever come about that would start Force to making this wonderful world? How did matter get into action?¹ 1. See Miley: Vol. I, pp. 82-83.

The truth is, the whole theory is an unphilosophical and irrational assumption and fabrication of Mill's brain. As an explanation of the existence of this world and an orderly universe, it is a dismal failure.

HUME succeeds no better. He reasons thus:

1. All our knowledge is founded on experience.
2. We have certain impressions made by external things, and certain passions and emotions; these are the only sources of our ideas, and therefore of our knowledge.
3. When he applies this principle to our idea of causation, he says, all we can know on the subject is that one object or event is contiguous and antecedent to another. This is all we perceive, and all of which we can have an impression.
4. We have no impression of power, efficacy, energy, force, or whatever equivalent term we may choose to use. Therefore, there is no such thing. There is no such thing as efficacy or power either in mind or matter. "When we use such words we have really no distinct meaning." "Of all the paradoxes which I have had occasion to advance, the present one is the most violent, and only by solid reasoning can I hope it will overcome the inveterate prejudices of mankind."¹ 1. Hume: "Treatise of Human Nature," Vol. I, pp. 216-220.
5. "We can never have reason to believe that any object exists of which we cannot form an idea."
6. "According to the precedent doctrine, there are no objects which, by the mere survey, without consulting experience, we can determine to be the causes of any other; and no objects which we can certainly determine in the same manner not to be causes. Anything may produce anything. Creation, annihilation, motion, reason, volition, all these may arise from one another, or from any other object we can imagine."²
2. Hodge: Vol. I, pp. 212-214.

We forbear quoting any more such nonsense.

1. Such foolish assertions mock intelligence and insult reason. If "anything may produce anything," then a lump of dirt may create the planet Jupiter, or the Constellation of Orion.
2. He contradicts himself. He says there is no such thing as efficacy or power; and then says "anything may produce anything."
3. What he calls "inveterate prejudices," are really laws of belief, the primary truths of reason, which God has impressed on our nature, and which all the sophistry of infidels can never take from us. Hume discredits them simply because they lead us to a belief in God.
4. The thoughtful reader will notice that Mill says that "Force" has created the universe. Hume says "there isn't any such thing as power or force, or efficacy or energy." Thus these men unite in rejecting the idea of God, but annihilate each other. It is amazing what insensate folly men can be guilty of who set themselves against the truth and God.

These are great men, if measured by their intellectual power. But a noble professor in one of our greatest educational institutions says: "It takes a great man to make a great fool of himself."

The universe is a fact and must have had an adequate, intelligent cause. The starry heavens reveal a master mind and omnipotent hand. Our sun is 866,000 miles in diameter, and is some 1,400,000 times larger than this world. With its eight planets, twenty-six moons, eight hundred asteroids together with an unknown number of comets and meteors, it is sweeping through space at the rate of twelve miles a second off toward the great star, Vega, and has been doing so for millions of years. The sun moves 400,000,000 miles a year, and it would take it five hundred thousand years more to pass Vega.

Astronomers tell us that the largest telescopes now bring into view one hundred million such suns, many of them inconceivably vaster than our King of day, and "this number is multiplied a thousand times by the photographs of the heavens." The North Star is nearly one hundred times larger than our sun. It is really composed of three suns, two of them waltzing around a central third once in twelve years. It is forty years distant from us measured by the flight of light.

But Sirius is 5,000 times larger than our sun and is speeding through space, ten miles a second. Rigel is 8,000 times larger. Alcyone is 12,000 times larger. Betelgeuze is 22,000 times larger.

Arcturus, spoken of in the book of Job is more than 86,000,000 miles in diameter, and one million times larger than our sun. It is sweeping through space with its vast retinue of lesser suns at the amazing speed of two hundred and sixty miles a second. Light is one hundred and sixty years coming from it to our little world.

And what of the giant sun Canopus? It is 134 times greater in diameter than our sun, or 116,000,000 miles. It is 18,000 times larger in surface than our sun. It is 49,000 times brighter than our sun. It is 2,400,000 times larger than our sun.

Astronomers tell us, it is distant from us 489 light years away, and that Canopus is the center of streams of millions of suns revolving about this stupendous orb. One photograph of a part of the sky twice as big as the moon's surface showed 65,000 of these suns, 40,000 years distant from us, measured by the speed of light.

A noted French astronomer, Charles Nordman, told us in 1919, that our Milky Way comprises fifteen hundred million suns. And there is an enormous class of stars or suns which do not belong to our Milky Way. They are known as the spiral nebulae. These are in appearance little vapory spots, formed by two spirals. But each is in itself precisely a Milky Way, an isolated universe with millions of suns, and billions of planets, that are 70,000 light years distant from us.

The French astronomer Laplace estimated that the probability that the forty-three independent motions of the bodies of the solar system known in his day should coincide in direction by chance would be 4,400,000,000,000 times to 1 in "favor of some common cause for the uniformity of direction" or in favor of purpose or design."

If the evidence of probability for the controlling hand of God in our solar system is so vast, what would be the greatness of the probability of the controlling hand of God in this vast universe, with billions of suns going in flocks across the infinite fields of space, in different directions, and different rates of speed without disaster or collision? Throughout the universe perfect order reigns.

In the midst of endless diversity there is harmony and unity. The same laws of gravitation, light and heat prevail. Such law and order, on a scale so vast, give overwhelming evidence of the control of an infinite and beneficent mind.

When we turn from the infinite to the infinitesimal, we are equally filled with wonder. A 3/8-inch cut of a clematis vine shows 40,000 holes or pores beautifully arranged. A spider's web almost invisible is woven of 3,000 strands. A million feathers are on the wings of a butterfly, and 40,000 lenses are in its eyes. Whales one hundred feet long live on the microscopic animals in water in Northern seas, millions in a single drop. We are told, there are forty billion shells of animals in one cubic inch of limestone rock, underlying Columbus, Ohio and the strata of rock is three thousand feet thick.

And as if this were not bewildering enough to a reflecting mind, Sir Oliver Lodge adds the following: "The atom of hydrogen, the smallest and lightest of all known atoms, is now believed to be made up of some seven hundred "electrons"-a name given to the ultimate particles of matter, each of which is charged with electricity. He asks us to consider an atom as an infinitely little solar system. If the electron be conceived of as having the size of a period, at the end of a sentence, the relative size of an atom of hydrogen would be that of a church one hundred and sixty feet long, eighty feet broad and forty feet high. Less than a thousand electrons occupy the atom, in the sense that an army occupies a country. They prevent anything else from entering, although they do not fill a trillionth part of the space. They are in violent motion, yet there is little danger of collision, for the electrons are much farther apart in proportion to their size than are the planets of our solar system, and having a speed probably one tenth that of light" ("The First Chapter of Genesis," by Albert L. Gridley, A. M., p. 59).

Now we say, when men, living in the midst of such astounding revelations of the sciences, assume infidelity and deny the existence of an infinitely wise God, and substitute dead matter and blind "Force" in His place, they are playing the fool with their own intellects. Our indignation finds vent in the language of the Psalmist: "The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God." Even Cicero was wise enough to say that it is as impossible that an ordered world could be formed by the fortuitous concourse of atoms as that a book could be composed by throwing about letters at random."

Conclusion. In spite of all these infidel sophistries this argument for God will stand. The principle of causation remains true. Every event must have a cause. The universe is a fact and must have had an adequate intelligent cause. Such a cause reason cannot find in Collocations of matter and blind force. It does not help any to spell it with a capital "F." That is only intellectual trickery, promoted by a carnal heart. Reason declares that there must have been a sufficient, spontaneous, self-energizing power, with intelligence and omnipotent will. All these facts point to a personal, rational cause. THE WORLD'S EXISTANCE, so reason affirms, DEMANDS A PERSONAL GOD.

III. THE TELEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT.

This argument, stated as a syllogism, is the following:

Design supposes a designer.

The world everywhere exhibits marks of design.

Therefore the world owes its existence to an intelligent Author.

Teleology (telos and logos) means the doctrine of design or of rational purpose. Design means (1) the selection of an end to be attained. (2) The choice of means suitable for its attainment. (3) The actual use of the means to accomplish the given end.

So in this argument for the existence of God it is the doctrine of a rational purpose or design displayed in the creation of the cosmos, exemplified in the order and adjustment of parts, and the foresight and choice of ends, and the use of appropriate means for their attainment. Such a design proves intelligence, will and power.

1. Consider the evidence of design in the preparation of the earth for the abode of man. First the matter of the earth had to be thrown out at a proper distance from the Sun. It had to be sent spinning around in its orbit at exactly the right degree of speed, its centrifugal and centripetal forces so exactly balanced, that it will not fly off on a tangent away from its orbit, nor be drawn by attraction back to the sun.

Then it was so hot that no life could exist on this planet, and it had to be cooled. The early fire-formed rocks have no traces of life in them. Furthermore, an atmosphere had to be formed and light, heat, electricity and magnetism were utilized. Provision was made for the orderly succession of the seasons, and their annual return. Soil was prepared by the disintegration of the rocks, and water was created to do it. Clouds rode in the sky and carried the rain, and the dew was deposited.

Then God created plant life. It could not have sprung from inorganic matter. The earth was amply supplied with vegetation; then animal life succeeded, which depended on plants for food. Even higher and nobler forms of life appeared. By upheavals and submergences of the earth's surface the precious metals were brought within reach, and mines of coal were stored up in the bowels of the earth for the fuel of man. By the inclination of the earth's axis and by the flow of the warm ocean currents the fruitful portion of the earth was greatly increased. By mountain ranges and valleys, and rivers and lakes and moving rain-clouds the continents were prepared. No earthly father ever more thoughtfully built a home for the children of his love, than God prepared this world for the home of men. Last of all, he created man in his own image to have dominion over the earth. The evidence of thought and loving design is in it all.

2. Design is seen in the organs of our bodies. No work of art can compare with them for delicacy of construction in view of a definite use. A telescope is a marvelous instrument of mechanical skill designed to aid man in seeing distant objects. No one dreams of disputing the skill of the maker or the design of its designer. But it is incomparably inferior to the human eye, which suggested the principles of its construction. In the eye is the only nerve in the entire body susceptible to light and color. That nerve is spread out on the retina. The light is admitted through an orifice in the ball, which by the most delicate arrangement of muscles is enlarged or contracted according to the degree of the light. Here are perfect lenses to focus the light. The inner chamber is lined with a black pigment to render vision possible. A delicate muscular arrangement enables the eye to

instantly adjust itself to the distance of objects. These are a few of the wonders of the eye. And before birth it was formed in darkness, with a self-evident reference to the properties of light and the purpose of vision of which the little unborn creature for whose use it was fashioned knew absolutely nothing. If the eye does not prove an intelligent designer, then no work of man can indicate thought and purpose.

The same may be said of the ear. In its cavity lies the auditory nerve, the only nerve adapted for hearing. Here are the passage through the skull, the peculiar adjustments to report the vibration to the brain. All is most scientifically arranged to promote intercourse between animals and man. Through it the marvels of speech, and the charms of eloquence and music can get access to the human mind.

We cannot live without oxygen to vitalize the blood. The infant comes into the world with an apparatus all prepared to meet its necessity. There are the nostrils and the air-passage and the marvelously constructed lungs for the purification of the blood and the vitalizing of the whole body. In its formative state the infant did not breathe, other provision being made for it. But its foreseen necessity was provided for, by lungs, ready made and air for their use.

Food is as necessary as air. Therefore there must be a stomach as well as lungs. The unborn child needs no food; other provision, for the time, being made for it. But all the organs are made ready for the future need. The provision for teeth, the salivary glands to furnish the fluid, the oesophagus to convey it to the stomach, the gastric fluid found nowhere else, capable of dissolving and digesting it. Then what is good for nourishment is absorbed and all the rest is rejected. Truly we are "fearfully and wonderfully made." Loving forethought and design is seen on every hand. The whole body is a marvel of mechanical contrivances, and all the separate organs present incontestable evidence of foresight and wisdom.

3. Design is seen in the construction of animals as a whole, and their adaptation for their future life. The organs of sight, hearing, breathing, digestion and locomotion are so arranged and adjusted as to answer a common purpose. If the animal is to live in the sea, it has a different method of breathing and locomotion. If it is to be a bird moving through the air it has hollow bones, and wings. If its flight is to be especially rapid it has very large muscles on the breast to move its wings. If it is to be a waterfowl, it has a flat breast and webbed feet and very thick feathers impenetrable by water. Birds which wade have long necks, long legs and long bills. The bird that climbs is peculiarly adapted for climbing. Every thing is foreseen and provided for.

4. Design is seen in the instincts of animals. There is an unfailling correspondence between the instincts and the organs with which animals are endowed. The duck takes to water by an unfailling instinct, and land-birds avoid it. Birds and beasts of prey have an instinct to feed on flesh, and all the organs requisite to satisfy their craving. And the supply for their wants is at hand. Others feed on vegetation and their organs and instincts are provided accordingly. The instincts did not create the organs; nor did the organs create the instincts. The only rational conclusion is that an all-wise Creator adapted them to each other.

5. The provision of nature for the wants of the young is unanswerable evidence of design. As the young babe is about to be born, food is prepared for it beforehand, and the table is spread in its

mother's breasts. As the young animals come to the world they find the most suitable food prepared for them that the world contains. If this does not prove a foreseeing mind and providing care, nothing could.

6. Nature as a whole, throughout the world is full of such adaptations. There is a provision, vast and ample, for the necessities of vegetable and animal life. Both plants and animals must have air, light, heat, water and soil to produce the common food of all living things. Who created the light and the heat? Who made the sun and filled it with those life-giving rays that "go out through all the world and nothing is hid from the heat thereof"? Here is one great system of beneficent adjustments, harmonious and complete, all together filling the world with life and beauty and happiness. The honest mind looks upon it all with reverent wonder, and joins the men of old, who were not fools, in saying: "In wisdom hast thou made them all." "For thy glory they are, and were created." No wonder it takes a fool to say in his heart, "There is no God." Even Cicero was wise enough to say that it is as impossible that an ordered world could be formed by the fortuitous concourse of atoms as that a book should be composed by throwing about letters at random.

7. Notice the argument from the rational processes of nature. "If the cosmos were a resting existence," says Bowne, "we might possibly content ourselves by saying that things exist in such relations once for all, and that there is no going behind this fact. But the cosmos is no such rigid economy, but a process according to intelligible rules; and in this process the rational order is perpetually maintained or restored. The weighing and measuring continually goes on. In each chemical change, just so much of one element combines with just so much of another. In each change of place the intensities of attraction and repulsion are instantaneously adjusted to correspond. The qualitative and quantitative adjustment of all things, according to fixed law is a fact of the utmost significance. The displacement of an atom by a hair's breadth demands a corresponding re-adjustment in every other within the grip of gravitation. But all are in constant movement, and hence re-adjustment is continuous and instantaneous. The single law of gravitation contains a problem of such bewildering vastness that our minds faint in the attempt to grasp it; but when the other laws of force are added, the complexity defies all understanding. In addition we might refer to the building processes in organic forms, whereby countless structures are constantly produced, or maintained, and always with regard to the typical form in question. But there is no need to dwell upon this point."

"Here, then, is a problem, and we have only the two principles of intelligence and non-intelligence, of self-directing reason and blind necessity, for its solution. The former is perfectly adequate and is not far-fetched and violent. It assimilates the facts to our own experience, and offers the only ground of order of which that experience furnishes any suggestion. If we adopt this view all the facts become luminous and consequent.

"If we take the other view, then we have to assume a power which produces the intelligible and the rational, without itself being intelligent and rational. It works all things, and in each with exact reference to all, yet without knowing anything of itself or of the rules it follows, or of the order it finds, or of the myriad products full of seeming purpose which it incessantly produces and maintains. If we ask why it does this we must answer, BECAUSE IT MUST. If we ask how we know that it must, the answer must be, BY HYPOTHESIS. But this reduces to saying that things are as they are because they must be.. That is, THE PROBLEM is ABANDONED ALTOGETHER.

The facts are referred to an opaque hypothetical necessity." That is the folly to which any one is driven who attempts to explain the processes of nature without God. There is no explanation why an oak tree grows instead of a beech tree, or why both grow side by side in the same soil, except in theism.

But materialism looks upon all these wonderful organs, and their adjustments to each other, and their combinations in living beings, sees all these living processes going on producing their appropriate results with an accuracy that no man-made machine ever approached, and denies any purpose, and all finality in their formation. It declares that eyes were not made for seeing, nor ears for hearing, nor feet for walking; nor hands for cunning achievement and skill, nor a stomach for digesting, and so on. We happen to have eyes and so we see; ears, and so we hear; feet, and so we walk; hands, and so they perform their deft ministries; a stomach conveniently located and we devote ourselves to feeding it, and, lo! by a combination of these and a hundred other organs, by chance there comes to be a seeing, hearing, walking, toiling, effective man. But in no instance was there any foresight or intent or purpose in any organ or the combination of them. The creation of a man was not thought of or intended. It all just happened! Such philosophy is consummate irrationalism, bordering on the insane or the idiotic.

Objections to This Argument.

1. It is objected that there are malformations in organic structures. We may answer that these can be accounted for by secondary causes which the doctrine of final purpose in a Creator does not exclude.
2. There are sometimes organs that are seemingly useless. We answer: They are few in number; and the most that can be said is that their use is not apparent. The use of the spleen in higher animals is unknown; but it may have a use yet undiscovered. It may not be absolutely essential to life; yet it may have a beneficent subordinate use.
3. It is objected that there are rudimentary organs. It is sufficient to answer, that there-are two sorts of finality-"that of use and that of plan, neither of which contradicts finality of end. Such organs may be left to show the unity of type in creation- a souvenir of the primitive plan." There may also have been an atrophy of the organs from disuse.
4. It is objected that animal instinct is a blind impulse, without prevision or plan and yet it works to ends. But animal instinct, instead of warranting any inference adverse to the doctrine of finality, demands finality, or a divinely planned end as the only rational account of the many offices which it so wonderfully fulfills in the economy of animal life. Besides, it is only an assumption that animals do not do what they do from intelligence,-an assumption which never can be proved.
5. It is objected by Kant that, admitting the evidences of design in nature, it would only prove a demiurgus, or world-builder, and not an extra-mundane God, or, at least, it would not prove Him to be infinite.

We answer, the immensity of the universe, through the whole of which design is manifest, proves that its cause must be adequate to such an effect. This with the cosmological argument proves Him

to be a creator; and creation of such a universe, so filled with evidence of design and skill, implies the work of an infinite God. The universe proves the purposive agency of a divine mind. The creation of stars inconceivably vast in size, and the placing of them billions of miles from each other in perfect order, and keeping them there, implies an extra-mundane, infinite, personal God.

III. THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL ARGUMENT.

This is an argument in logical form much like the Cosmological and Teleological Arguments. But it is an argument derived wholly from the nature of man and brings up considerations and proofs not heretofore presented.

We have already observed that every man has in his own nature the evidence of the existence of God, which can never be obliterated and which will force conviction upon the most unwilling.

"It is no less true that every man has in himself the same irresistible evidence that God is an extra-mundane personal Being," that He is intelligent, voluntary and moral; that He knows; that He has the right to command"; that we are under obligation to obey.

Then it may be asked, "If every man has in his own nature a witness whose competency he cannot question, and whose testimony he cannot ignore, why need we argue matter at all?" Three reasons may be given.

(1) Men of a speculative turn of mind deny even the primary truths of reason.

(2) Because the carnal mind is strongly tempted to deny the existence of God.

(3) Because infidels are continually making efforts to undermine the faith of men in the existence of God.¹ 1. Hodge, Vol. I, pp. 233, 234.

1. Notice the Constitution of Man as a Whole.

Here we have a peculiar proof of divine purpose in his construction. He stands at the head of the animal kingdom. In complexity and completeness of structure and symmetry of form he is the wonder of science. His body is so wondrously fitted to be the instrument of his indwelling mind that he gives abundant evidence of a rational intelligence in the Author of his being.

From Shakespeare to Daniel Webster, men have described in eloquent strains man's erect form and noble presence, so appropriate to his higher mission and destiny as ruler of the world. Volumes have been written about the human hand as a miracle of deftness and strength and cunning. Back of all the wonderful machines that the brain of Edison ever conceived there must be the constructing and managing human hand. Added to all the sublime artistic conceptions of Angelo and Raphael there must be the skillful hand to wield the brush and chisel. Evolutionists place the skeleton of the ape beside the skeleton of man and tell us there is not much difference between the hands of the two. But the Duke of Argyll has well observed that to get the real difference between the two we must compare the work of one with that of the

other. The difference is well-nigh infinite. With only ape's hands we should never have attained the rudiments of civilization.

As much may be said of the human voice, so adapted to the expression of human thought, so responsive to every emotion and sentiment and feeling of the soul. Had we been given for voice and language the squealing of pigs, or the lowing of cattle, or the chattering of monkeys, how contemptible must have been the fate of our race! One has said that the organ which makes possible this voice, in all its high and soulful uses, is as wonderful as the voice itself.

The truth is, every organ of man, considered by itself, and all of them combined in a human being, call forth the inspired exclamation, "we are wonderfully and fearfully made" for dominion and power. The combination of such organs in a structure so peculiarly fitted to be the temporary home of a God-like mind, is no accident, or product of blind, unintelligent force. Fortuity as a cause is too absurd and unthinkable for consideration. The only other explanation which reason can suggest is the ruling mind of an ALL WISE CREATOR.

2. THE ARGUMENT FROM THE EXISTENCE OF MIND.

Every man's consciousness tells him he has a mind. He knows that he is an intelligent, personal being. He is perfectly sure that his personality does not dwell in his body, but in his soul. Consciousness makes him aware that his soul and body are distinct, and that they are entirely different substances having attributes radically unlike and incompatible. This consciousness shows itself in the common thought and speech of mankind and in the universal belief of existence after death.

THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL ARGUMENT

Nobody ever thinks of denying this but some speculative theorist, who seems ambitious to acquire a reputation for infidelity.

Now the question inevitably presents itself to the mind, how is the existence of this immaterial, thinking, immortal substance which we call self to be accounted for? It has not always existed. It began to be. Then its cause was outside of itself; for it could not cause itself to be before itself existed. How then came it to be?

1. It cannot be conceived of as being derived from an unending series of ancestors. The unending series argument is an absurdity.
2. It cannot be conceived of as having no origin. Thought, feeling, willing, hoping, fearing, consciousness, are phenomena which must have a ground in essential being. "Outright nihilism is outright hallucination."
3. It cannot be conceived of as being a product of the body, or of physical forces. The properties of matter and mind are too unlike. The properties of matter are extension, figure, weight, divisibility, inertia, and the like. The properties or attributes of mind are thought, reason, reflection, consciousness, choice, spontaneity.

The two classes of phenomena and attributes have nothing in common. You cannot put weight and thought in the same category, or divisibility and memory, or inertia and free will. Mental facts cannot be the predicates of matter, because they are contradictory to its nature; matter cannot be the ground of mental facts. Intelligence cannot be the product of what is unintelligent. Spiritual mind must be the ground of mental facts.

4. Some have sought the solution of the problem in the theory of naturalistic evolution. Of this theory even Tyndal speaks in no flattering terms as follows: "For what are the core and essence of this hypothesis? Strip it naked and you stand face to face with the notion that not only the more ignoble forms of animal life, not alone the noble forms of the horse and lion, not alone the exquisite and mechanism of the human body, but that the mind itself-emotion, intellect, will and all their phenomena-were once latent in a fiery cloud. Surely the mere statement of such a notion is more than a refutation."

"These evolution notions are absurd, monstrous, and fit only for the intellectual gibbet, in relation to the ideas conceiving matter which were drilled into us when young."¹ "But the hypothesis would probably go even farther than this. Many who hold it would probably assent to the position that all our philosophy, all our poetry, all our science, all our art-Plato, Shakespeare, Newton, and Raphael-are potential in the fires of the sun." 1. Tyndall, *Fragments of Science*, pp. 453, 454.

Now the common-sense of mankind pronounces this notion a monstrous absurdity." It asks the pointed and unanswerable question, "How could this primordial fire-mist evolve itself into intelligence, sensibility and will,-into personality-and betake itself to the study of philosophy, and the construction of the sciences, so as to trace its own lineage back through an unbroken series of casualities to the firemist of which it was born?" How can nature, without any conception of an end, produce a man that has such an idea of final cause, and purposed result? With a divine Creator of mind, we have a sufficient account of its origin and personality. This is the only sufficient account. Human minds, with their only possible origin in a creative agency of God, affirm the truth of this existence.¹ 1. Miley, Vol. I, pp. 102, 103.

3. The Argument from the Capacities and Wants of the Soul.

Two facts seem to rule in Nature universally. The first of these is that whatever capacity, necessity, or desires exist, or are found in any organism, adequate provision is made for their satisfaction.

Plants need light, moisture, air, and soil; there is provided for them an adequate supply of each. Every necessity is met. The same is true of the animal kingdom. There is light for the eye: there is water for the fins of a fish: there is air for the wing of a bird: there is a supply for the wants of every living thing.

The other law is that all these living organisms reach perfection, and fully accomplish the end of their being. They reach their full development, and, that too, in their immediate environments.

This is true of all known beings but man. It is true of man's physical being. He has his wants satisfied and his bodily necessities are met, and he attains his normal development.

But this is not true of his soul. It has capacities which are not fully developed in this world and never can be. It has desires, aspirations, and necessities for which the world does not furnish the appropriate objects. (1) It has intellectual powers capable of indefinite expansion, which in this world never reach their utmost limit. With these is connected a desire of knowledge which is never satisfied. (2) It also has a capacity for happiness which this world can never fill. (3) The soul has aspirations which reach out beyond its environments, beyond human companionships and all earthly helps and helpers, and never cease their seeking flight until they reach the throne of the Eternal. The soul has wants deep as the depths of being which only God can supply. It needs support which finite strength cannot give; sympathy which finite beings cannot impart; forgiving, healing, cleansing, redeeming love which only the Infinite Father in Heaven can bestow. Now, as certainly as the webbed foot and flat breast of the water fowl betoken the existence of water, and the eye is a prophecy of light, and the lungs are an evidence of air, and the instinct of the migratory bird is a prophecy of a sunny South for its Winter home, so is the thirst of the Soul for God an undeniable evidence that there is a God for the soul. "Such a being as man necessitates the assumption of such a Being as God." 2. Hodge, Vol. I, pp. 23S-237.

4. The Argument from The Moral Nature of Man.

The idea of obligation, or of oughtness, is an idea of the pure reason. It is a simple, rational conception, and, like other primary truths, does not admit of a definition. No being could be made to understand it who has not felt it. Obligation is the term by which we express a conception that all men have of right and wrong, and the duty to do right. This idea finds expression in every human language, and no conception is more common or universal in the minds of men.

Now the familiar facts of consciousness on this subject may be brought together as follows:

(1) By the very constitution of our nature we have an immediate perception of right and wrong. We know, without instruction, that some motives and states of heart are right and others are wrong. It is an infallible judgment, from which there is no appeal.

(2) These moral perceptions are distinct from all other notions or judgments of the mind. They cannot be confused with the axioms of mathematics, or the ideas of beauty, or of the true. They form a class by themselves. Something in us asserts that we are bound to approve and do the right, and disapprove and turn away from the wrong.

(3) These moral judgments are spontaneous, and self-originated. They are not under the control of the understanding or of the will. Just as no man will deny that a whole is equal to all its parts, so no man will deny or question the verdict of his moral nature about his own inner state. He cannot argue himself into a conviction that he is right, if the inner voice declares him to be wrong.

(4) This faculty of the soul with its sense of obligation, its endorsement of right and condemnation of wrong and foreboding of punishment is called Conscience. Dr. Samuel Harris, of Yale, denned Conscience as, "Right reason recognizing itself as law." It has an authority from which we cannot

emancipate ourselves. We cannot deny or ignore it. It is a sovereign which we are bound to obey. It is a judge whose verdict we cannot but fear; for it can reward or punish. Its reward of approval is an unspeakable blessing: its condemnation is the direct curse.

(5) Such a moral judge involves the idea of moral law- There must be some fixed standard of duty, some measure and test of obligation, to which life and conduct must be conformed. That inward purpose or state of heart is right which conforms to this standard or moral law: that purpose is wrong which does not conform to it.

(6) But such a moral law involves the idea of a lawgiver. This law did not originate with us. We instinctively, inevitably feel that the lawmaker was a Someone outside of ourselves.

(7) And this moral law, and this lawgiver, outside of ourselves, involve the idea of responsibility to God. For this Being to whom we are responsible must be a Person with a moral nature like our own, "who knows us altogether," what we are, and what we ought to be, and ought to do. One of old said, "He that made the eye shall He not see? He that made the ear can He not hear?" and we may add, He that gave us intellect, sensibilities and free will, the essential faculties of personality, hath He not the same? He that made that Conscience that is present in all minds and asserts its right to rule all lives, and exerts itself magisterially in every breast, has He no conscience, no sense of duty, no knowledge of right or wrong?

Kant said: "Every man has conscience, and finds himself inspected by an inward censor, by whom he is threatened and kept in awe; and this power, watching over the law, is nothing arbitrarily adopted by himself, but is interwoven with his substance."¹ Again Kant exclaims, "Duty! thou great, thou exalted name! Wondrous thought! that workest . . . merely by holding up thy naked law in the soul, and so extorting for thyself always reverence, if not obedience-whence thy original? and whence find we the root of thy descent?" I. Kant: *Metaphysics of Ethics*, p. 245

The only answer which reason, and sound philosophy can give to this question is-"God,"-the great moral lawgiver, who made and inhabits the mind of man. Some one has said: "It is not so much that we have a conscience, as that conscience has us," in its relentless grip.

While thus conscience is the central fact and proof of a moral personality in man, it is also the clearest proof of a moral personality in God.

(8) It is this awful moral nature of man as revealed in conscience that furnishes unanswerable proof of the moral character of God. If God had been an unrighteous Being, would He have given to man so distinct and authoritative a witness on the side of righteousness? Would He have put an inward monitor in every breast whose legislative mandates and judicial decisions were all in favor of virtue and holiness, which He Himself did not possess? It is unthinkable; and so conscience remains, amidst all the disorders of society, and the follies of man, a steady, silent, unswerving and incorruptible witness to the holiness of God.

Conclusion. The cumulative proof of these several arguments becomes irresistible. We rest assured that there is an eternal personal God, over and above all His works,-the Creator of the Universe, infinite in power, wisdom, goodness, truth and holiness.

* * * * *

CHAPTER II -- ANTITHEISTIC THEORIES

Theism is the doctrine of an extra-mundane, personal God, the Creator, Preserver, and Governor of all things. Any theory, therefore, that denies Him a personality, or a moral character, or denies that He is distinct from His works and more than all He has made, or that He cannot be known in such a sense as to be loved, feared and adored, is antitheistic.

The various forms that anti-theism has taken may be discussed under the following heads: Atheism, Pantheism, Positiveism, Materialism, Secularism, Agnosticism.

I. ATHEISM

Other theories, as we shall see, have atheistic tendencies in them. But there is an avowed Atheism. It means the open and positive denial of the existence of God, or an intelligent First Cause, or a Superintending Providence. It is a purely negative system of thought. It affirms nothing. It simply denies whatever Theism asserts. The arguments of the previous chapter sufficiently answer it.

Atheism is a disreputable doctrine. Few men are willing to be called Atheists. It is said that Hume resented it. Helvetius said: "There is no man of understanding who does not admit an active principle in nature; therefore there is no Atheist. He is not an Atheist who says that motion is God, . . . and by it all things are performed in the universe." Cousin says: "Atheism is impossible, because the existence of God is implied in every affirmation. If a man believes that he exists, he must believe in the power of thought, and that is God." Herbert Spencer claims to be religious: his two principles of faith are, Force is, and Force is persistent.

But the word "God" has a definite meaning in the language of men, and it cannot be changed to accommodate every infidel. It means an Infinite, Self-conscious, Self-acting, Personal Being. If any one reduces this being to "force," "motion," "power of thought," "moral order," "the unknowable" or any "somewhat" abstraction, he is playing atheist.

It is still a debated question whether real Atheism is possible. Dr. Charles Hodge answers as follows: "If the question be, whether a man can emancipate himself from the conviction that there is a personal Being to whom he is responsible for his character and conduct, and who will punish him for his sins it must be answered in the negative. For that would be to emancipate himself from the moral law, which is impossible. If, however, the question means, whether a man may, by speculation or otherwise, bring himself into such a state as to lose, for a time, the consciousness of the belief of God, as written in his heart: and free himself from its power, it must be answered affirmatively. A man may, in this sense, also deny his own individuality or identity; the real objective existence of soul or body, mind or matter, the distinction between right and wrong. But this is unnatural and cannot last. It is like deflecting a spring by force. The moment the force is removed the spring returns to its normal position. Men, therefore, often pass in a moment from such a state of entire skepticism to a state of unquestioning faith." 1. Hodge, Vol. I, p. 242

In much the same way Dr. Miley answers: "Profound thinkers deny that there ever was an instance of Speculative, dogmatic Atheism. But we think in the possible aberrances of the mind, there is the possibility of Atheism. Yet the instances are rare or transient. . . . The moral and religious sentiments, native to the soul, and never permanently repressible, must rise in resentful protest against it."

"Primarily and directly, atheism is the negation of God. Of all negation, this is the greatest that the human mind can think or utter. For it cannot remain alone, but must carry with it many others of profound moment. The negation of the divine existence is the negation of all related truths. If there is no God, there can be no Son of God; and, hence, no incarnation, no atonement, and no salvation. There can be no spiritual existence. Matter must be all. There is no mind in nature, no intelligence that planned the earth and the heavens, and no omnipotent will that set them in order, or that preserves their harmonies. There are no intuitions or absolute truths: for atheism is as thorough a negation of our reason as of our God. There can be no spontaneity or freedom of mind. There is no mind. Mental phenomena are a mere physical process determined by mechanical force. There can be no moral obligation or responsibility. Morality is no duty. Whatever expediency may urge in behalf of secular interests, without God there can be no ground of moral duty. There is no future existence. Death is the oblivion of man, just as it is the oblivion of a beast."²

Such a theory plunges a man into a fathomless abyss of intellectual, moral and spiritual ruin. And by every principle of reason, the theory is absolutely unproveable. 2. Miley, Vol. I, pp. Ill, 112

II. PANTHEISM

While Atheism denies the existence of God, Pantheism-from pan-all, and theos-God-is the doctrine that God includes all reality. The universe is God and God is the universe. "He is the one and the all." "Besides God, no substance can exist, or be conceived to exist," said Spinoza.

He held that there was one simple substance-God, known to us through the two attributes of infinite thought and infinite extension, neither of which implied personality. This substance was self-operative from the force of an inward necessity, without choice or reference to ends. All finite existences are merely phenomena."

It will be seen at once how irrational and unscientific this is. Thought is not an attribute of substance, but an act of a personal mind, and extension is a spatial quality of extended being. His theory of a one substance with two attributes is a baseless assumption.

Pantheism seems in the main to have assumed three forms. (1) That which ascribes to the Infinite and Universal Being, the attributes of both mind and matter, or thought and extension. (Spinoza's theory.) (2) That which ascribes to it only the attributes of matter.-Materialistic Pantheism. (3) That which ascribes to it only the attributes of Spirit, Idealistic Pantheism.

Some writers give six different forms the doctrine has assumed. But whether more or less, the systems all tend to the following logical inferences or conclusions, which are startling in the extreme.

1. They deny all dualism in the Universe. The essential distinctions between matter and mind, soul and body between God and the world, between the infinite and finite is repudiated. Cousin says: "The finite cannot exist without the infinite, and the infinite can only be realized by developing itself in the finite.
2. Whatever the infinite may be, matter or spirit, thought or force, it has no existence apart from the world. The world is therefore, consubstantial and co-eternal with God.
3. There is no such thing as creation; except as an eternal and necessary process of evolution.
4. They deny that the Infinite, Absolute Being, has either intelligence, consciousness, or will.
5. Pantheism denies the personality of God, Personality as well as consciousness implies a distinction between the Self and the Not Self; and such a distinction they hold is a limitation inconsistent with the nature of the infinite. God therefore is not a person who can say "I," and can be addressed as "Thou." Cousin says: "Take away nature and the soul, and every sign of God disappears. What the soul would be without faculties and without consciousness, that is God without the Universe." Dr. Hodge pertinently remarks: "An unconscious God without life, of whom nothing can be predicated but simple being, is not only not a person, but he is, for us, simply nothing."
6. Man is not an individual subsistence. He is but a moment in the life of God; a wave on the surface of the sea; a leaf which falls and is renewed year after year."
7. When the body, which makes the distinction of persons among men, perishes, personality ceases with it. There is no conscious existence for man after death. Schleiermacher said in a sermon: "The piety in which I was nurtured in my youth remained with me when the God and immortality of my childhood disappeared from my doubting sight." In other words, the personal God of the Moravian faith was exchanged for the impersonal God of philosophy. The absorption of the soul in God, the finite into the Infinite, is the highest destiny that Pantheism can offer to man.
8. If man is only a mode of God's existence, it logically follows that all man's acts are the acts of God, whether good or bad. Also, since the acts of God are necessary, it follows that there is no such thing as freedom of the will either in God or man. Spinoza said, "All things are determined by the necessity of the Divine Nature, to exist and to act, after a certain fashion."
9. Pantheism, in making man a mode of God's existence, and in denying all freedom of the will, precludes the possibility of sin. Man may have a subjective sentiment about right and wrong. But if God be at once God, nature and humanity; if reason in us be God's reason; his intelligence our intelligence, his activity our activity; if God be the substance of which the world is the phenomenon; if we are only moments in the life of God, then there can be nothing in us which is not in God, and all idea of human sin is a delusion. Spinoza says: "We speak improperly when we say that we sin against God, or that men offend God. Man is compelled to the pursuit of what is agreeable, and the hatred of the contrary. To follow this impulse is not only a necessity but it is the right and the duty of every man, and every one should be reckoned an enemy who wishes to hinder another in the gratification of the impulses of his nature. The measure of everyone's right is his

power. The best right is that of the strongest; and as the wise man has an absolute right to do all which reason dictates, so also the ignorant and foolish man has a right to live according to the laws of appetite. This evidently was the philosophy of modern Germany. Behold the result!

Could anything possibly be more diabolical than such a theory? It makes might right, and glorifies tyranny and oppression. It tells the cruel murderer or the brutal ravisher that he is Godlike in gratifying his impulse, and whoever hinders him is wrong.

Cousin unblushingly defends the same principles: "The vanquishing party not only serves the cause of civilization, but it is better and more moral than the vanquished party. Virtue and prosperity, misfortune and vice, are in necessary harmony. Feebleness is a vice, and therefore it is always punished and beaten. It is time that the philosophy of history put beneath its feet the declamations of philanthropy." So the infamous Nero, puissant with the might of Rome, was incarnate virtue! And the aged, feeble, holy Paul was incarnate vice!

But if Pantheism be true, if God is the life of the world, all power His power, every act His act, not only can there be no sin, but the most powerful are the best, and "might makes right," as German writers insisted.

10. Pantheism is self-deification. If God comes to existence only in the world, and everything there is a manifestation of God. Man being the highest creature, it follows that he is the most God, -the highest form of the divine existence. Every man is his own divinity! What a noble God some people have!

11. There is only one step further, the deification of Evil, and pantheists have not hesitated to take it. The wicked are only one form of the self-manifestation of God; sin is only one form of the activity of God. This blasphemous doctrine is explicitly avowed. If God be everything, and if there be a Satan, God must be Satan. So Rosenkranz taught unblushingly, and justified it by saying that "the mind is horrified at such language only because it does not recognize the intimate connection between good and evil."

In view of this deification of evil one has said: "This system should be called Pandiabolism instead of Pantheism. This is the true blasphemy of God-this veiled blasphemy-this diabolism of the deceitful angel of light-this speaking of reckless words, with which the man of sin sets himself in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. The Atheist cannot blaspheme with such a power as this; his blasphemy is merely negative. He merely says: There is no God' It is only out of Pantheism that a blasphemy can proceed, so wild, of such inspired mockery, so devoutly Godless, so desperate in its love of the world-a blasphemy so seductive, and so offensive that it may well call for the destruction of the world."

Dr. Charles Hodge's extended discussion we have greatly abridged in giving these eleven points, says: "Pantheism, however, becomes all things, to all men. To the pure it gives scope for sentimental religious feeling, which sees God in everything and everything in God. To the proud it is the source of intolerable arrogance and self-conceit. To the sensual it gives authority for every form of indulgence. Some of the most reputable of the Pantheistic School do not hesitate to say in reference to the trammels of morality: "It is well that the rights of our sensual nature should, from

time to time, be boldly asserted." 1 Tholuck said: "This system comes to the same result with the materialism of French encyclopedists, who mourned over mankind for having sacrificed the real pleasures of time for the imaginary pleasures of eternity, and the protracted enjoyments of life, for the momentary happiness of a peaceful death." 1. Hodge: Systematic Theology, Vol. I, pp. 300-308.

We quote one passage from Dr. Miley which may well close our discussion of this infamous system of thought. He says: "Pantheism is as really blank of all objective truth which can minister to the religious cravings of the soul as Atheism itself. 'There is no personality of God, no divine majesty for the Soul's reverence, no love for the inspiration of its own adoring love, no providence over us, no place for prayer, no knowledge of us, no heart-sympathy with us, no hand to help us, no 'Father in Heaven.' There can be no religious helpfulness in the idea of a being so utterly blank of all that the soul craves in God.'" 2. Miley's Theology, Vol. I, p. 116

III. POSITIVISM

Positivism originated with M. Auguste Comte, born 1798; died 1859. It is a pretentious but most impractical philosophy, claiming to be at once a philosophy, a polity, and a religion. It professes to systematize all scientific knowledge, to organize all industrial activities, and to satisfy all spiritual aspirations. It proposes for itself the modest task of explaining the past, instructing the present and forecasting the future, forming a religion "sans Dieu," without God, offering for worship humanity, symbolized by a woman.

With such a flourish of trumpets, one might well suppose it would utilize all the powers of the mind and all the best that man has thought or been. But it does not. It could not be more dwarfed and narrow. It discounts all the profoundest intuitions of the mind, and the foundation principles of reason, and admits nothing in its philosophy but natural phenomena revealed by the senses. We only know positively what the senses reveal. They are the only source of knowledge, hence nothing exists but matter. There is no mind distinct from matter; no such thing as efficiency; no cause, either secondary or final; no God; no future state of existence for man. All we know is that there is an endless sequence of events chasing each other in uniform and necessary but unrelated succession. Nothing more must be admitted as knowledge, but the facts of phenomena.

It will be seen that Positivism is the extreme of phenomenalism. Not only the intuitions are set at nought, but the facts of consciousness are denied to knowledge. There are no truths of the reason, no ontological realities. Properties do not prove a substance. Effects do not prove a cause. "Mental phenomena, and there is no such thing discoverable as either an origin or purpose in the world, as consequently either a creative or providential intelligence."

According to Comte, there are three states or forms of thought through which the whole humanity, and each individual man passes, which he calls the theological, the metaphysical, and the positive.

(1) In the first state all facts of change are attributed to some supernatural agency; this is the theological state. (2) In the second the facts of change are attributed to the intrinsic forces of nature. This is the metaphysical state, entertaining the idea of substance and cause. That is, phenomena are the result of occult powers or forces which the senses do not detect. (3) The third

state is the positive in which all thought of the supernatural, or of natural cause or force is dismissed, and men come to recognize that there are no spiritual agencies or physical causes, but only passing events, or phenomena of nature. Humanity is now in this stage. Every individual man, in his progress from infancy to manhood, passes through these several stages. We first believe in supernatural agencies, witches, ghosts, souls, angels and God; then in occult physical causes; then only in facts discerned by the senses. These are mutually exclusive. Such is the foundation of the Positive philosophy.

We make the following observations:

1. His theory of the three stages of individual and race development in thought is a pure assumption and absolutely untrue. The race has not abandoned faith in the supernatural and accepted Positivism. It may be doubted if there is one in ten thousand of our entire race who does not believe in God. The advance of knowledge has banished witch craft, necromancy, and kindred follies from the minds of men; but it has not expelled a belief in mind as distinct from matter, or in efficient causes, or in God.

2. There is no such development of the race or of the individual. Human experience is against the theory well-nigh universally. An individual does not begin in the theological and end in the positive state. The child is more positivistic, -that is, is more effected by phenomena than he will be in later years, when he knows more of God and the causal forces of Nature. Also the most highly civilized peoples have a more profound regard for God, and the laws of nature than the lower tribes of men.

3. These several states of mind are not mutually exclusive. The profoundest students of nature's laws and forces still believe in God. Positivism does not dominate the thought of this most scientific age of the world. The notion that mature men abandon all thought of God and the laws of cause and effect is intellectual foolery. Comte's law of the three states breaks down at every point. Huxley says: "It is absurd to say of men in a state of primitive savagery, that all their conceptions are in a theological state. Nine tenths of them are eminently realistic, and as "positive" as ignorance and narrowness can make them."¹ 1. Huxley's, Lay Sermons and Addresses, p. 178.

4. Comte was in error in his classification of sciences. He professes to accept nothing in his system but phenomena. Then he names mathematics as the simplest science in his system. But what has mathematics to do with phenomena? It is a purely mental science and has nothing to do with phenomena. "There is nothing outward for the organic eye; all is for the inner eye of the mind." Then his biology is made to include the whole man just as it includes the animal and the plant. The mind has no place in his scheme. It cannot have in a system which repudiates all the inner facts of consciousness. His classifications therefore, do not include all the facts and, hence, are not scientific, but are forced and fanciful and arbitrary.

5. By his very scheme of thought, Comte affronts human nature, and asks every man who accepts his philosophy to stultify himself. But it is idle to try to reason men out of their senses, and attempt to make them believe that their nature is a lie. They act upon and use their intuitions in all the common affairs of life. They assume that effects have a cause, that the axioms are true, that we are free agents, that there is a difference between right and wrong, that there is a God to whom man is

responsible. But Positivism denies it all. Men will be very slow to throw away their common sense to please any philosopher.

6. To crown his folly and make it complete, Comte, after denying all the facts and primal truths of our nature that would make a religion possible, proceeded to construct a new religion of Positivism. His system of thought was so utterly atheistic in tendency and foreign to religion, that this freak disgusted many of his followers. The character of the new religion did not commend it to the thinking mind. But as men always have had a religion, and must have one to satisfy them, this philosophy which aspired to universal dominion, must make some provision for this universal, even though imaginary, necessity of our nature. Comte, therefore, put out a catechism of religious belief and worship "Sans Dieu," with no God in it. The aggregate of humanity, formed by the absorption of the successive generations of men, was the object of worship. Every great man has two forms of existence; one conscious before death; the other after death, an unconscious influence, in the hearts and intellects of other men. The God of the Positive Philosophy is, therefore, the aggregate of the memories of great men. There was to be a priesthood and a Pope. Society must be absolutely subject to this new religious regime. No individual liberty, and no rights of conscience were to be tolerated.

There were to be two forms of worship, one private, the other public. The special object of private worship was woman, because she is the most perfect representative of humanity. The memory of great men was to be the object of public worship. There were to be ten sacraments, a peculiar architecture, and an extended hierarchy under the control of one absolute High Priest."

No wonder such a parody on religion disgusted men. Huxley bitterly characterized it, "Catholicism minus Christianity." Mill joined in these criticisms. Comte retorted savagely that the men who accepted his philosophy and rejected his religion were "deficient in brains."

The quarrel is not ours. But we may observe in closing, how amazing it is that men should undertake with such philosophical trash to overthrow Christianity! It is seventy years since Comte died, and the religion of Jesus still stands, and is going on to possess the world. Human reason, with its absolute truths and authoritative conscience, with its sense of God and duty, will be slow to allow these primal beliefs to be supplanted by the follies of Positivism.

IV. MATERIALISM

Comte's Positivism was only one form of Materialism. Materialism is as old as Epicurus. It is that system which ignores the distinction between matter and mind, and refers all the phenomena of the world, whether physical, vital or mental, to the functions of matter. The soul is but the result of a peculiar organization of matter; the operations of mind are merely the effect of material forces; there is no existence beyond the grave, and, therefore, no moral accountability. Matter and force are the only entities, and these are sufficient to solve all the problems of the Universe.

How little originality there is in modern Materialism may be seen from these teachings of Epicurus. He taught: (1) The Universe has always existed and must exist forever. *Exnihilo nihil fit*. (2) Space, and the number of bodies which it contains are infinite. (3) These bodies are of two kinds, simple and compound. The simple bodies are atoms possessing form, magnitude and weight.

They are indivisible, unalterable and indestructible. This is the doctrine of modern science. (4) These atoms have their peculiar forms, distinct from their mere gravity. (5) The quantity of matter and the amount of force is always the same. Neither can be increased or diminished. (6) The atoms move through space with incredible velocity under the guidance of necessary physical laws. (7) By the combination of these atoms, under the influence of gravity and other physical forces, the universe was formed and became a Cosmos. This is very nearly the nebular hypothesis. (8) The soul ceases to exist when the body dies. It is the cessation of the vital and intellectual functions of the individual. (9) The soul is material, and all mental phenomena are due to the properties of matter. (10) Sensation is the only source of knowledge. By remembering former sensations we form ideas. (11) Nothing is incorporeal but a vacuum. As there is no mind or spirit, therefore there is no God or moral law. Virtue is only prudence.

A German writer in Herzog's Encyclopaedia declares, that the Materialists of our day have not advanced a step upon the system of Epicurus.¹ 1. Quoted from Ritter by Hodge, Vol. I, pp. 246, 247

The principles of modern Materialism may be stated as follows:

1. Matter and force are inseparable. Wherever there is matter there is force, and -vice versa.
2. All physical forces such as light, heat, chemical affinities, electricity, magnetism, etc., are convertible. Light may be converted into heat, and heat into light; either into electricity, and electricity into either.
3. The physical forces are not only convertible, one into any of the others, but they are also quantitatively equivalent; that is, a given amount of heat, will produce a given amount of light, or electricity, or any other force.
4. These purely physical forces produce everything, no other forces being known or knowable. They thus deny that vital force produces vital phenomena, and mental force produces mental phenomena, Materialists banish mind and vital force to the region of the unknown and the unknowable. Huxley says: "The matter of life is composed of ordinary matter, differing from it only in the manner in which its atoms are aggregated. It is built up of ordinary matter, and again resolved into ordinary matter when its work is done." "What justification is there for the assumption of the existence in the living matter of a something which has no representative or correlative, in the not-living matter? What better status has 'vitality' than 'agnosity'?" Others besides Huxley have accepted this physical theory of life, and hold that vital force is only a form or mode of ordinary motion.
5. Materialists carry the logic of their assumptions to the end, and declare that not only vital force in plant or animal, but even the thoughts of man, are the product of physical force in matter. Says Huxley: "The thoughts to which I am now giving utterance, and your thoughts regarding them are the expression of molecular changes... It is impossible to prove that anything whatever may not be the effect of a material and necessary cause . . . and human logic is incompetent to prove that any act is really spontaneous. . . . This means the extension of the province of what we call matter, and the gradual banishment from all regions of human thought of what we call spirit and spontaneity...

In other words, matter and spirit are but names for the imaginary substrata of groups of natural phenomena."1 1. Huxley's Lay Sermons, pp. 151-156.

All this put briefly means: All effects are produced by material causes; Spirit has only an imaginary existence; the spontaneous action of a human or Divine will is an absurdity; necessity is inexorable and universal; there is neither a human Spirit nor a God; the distinction between material and mental forces is obliterated, and the universe is created and ruled by fate.

Such opinions are openly avowed in the plainest terms in Germany. Otto Berger says: "Materialism is the philosophy of the five senses. It admits nothing but on the testimony of sensation, and therefore denies the existence of the soul, of God, and of everything super sensuous. In its modern form it teaches that, as the material is alone true and real, matter is uncreated and eternal. It always has been and always will be. It is indestructible, and, in its elements, unchangeable. Force is inseparable from matter. According to the theory, no matter is without force, and no force is without matter. No force exists of itself; and, therefore, there is none to which the Creation of matter is to be referred. The universe as it now is, is due to the gradual evolution of the two elements, matter and force, which evolution proceeds under the operation of fixed laws. The lower organisms are first formed; then the higher, until man appears. All life, whether vegetable, animal, or Spiritual, is due to the working of physical or chemical forces in matter. As no power exists but in matter, there can be no divine Being with creative power, nor any created human soul." He quotes Virchow as saying, "The scientific naturalist knows only bodies and the properties of bodies. All that is beyond them is transcendental, and the transcendental is the chimerical." He also quotes Vogt, as saying, "We admit of no Creator, either in the beginning, or in the course of the world's history; and regard the idea of a self-conscious, extramundane Creator as ridiculous."

Answer

It will be observed from the above that "The fundamental affirmation of Materialism is, that all the phenomena of the universe, physical, vital and mental, are to be referred to unintelligent physical forces. The fundamental negation is, that there is no such objective entity as mind or Spirit." We answer:

1. They assume the very thing that needs to be proved, namely, that there is no mind and no God, and everything is produced by matter and force. Unintelligent force cannot account for all the phenomena of the Universe. The effect cannot be greater than the cause. There is too much evidence of purpose, wisdom and thought in the world, and too much order and development in the life of plants, animals and man to believe that it could be produced by unthinking and unliving matter and force. The credulity of such a theory is immeasurable. Its absurdity is boundless.

Over against this Materialistic theory is the theory of Theism which teaches the existence of an infinite, extramundane God, who created matter endowed with forces, and finite minds gifted with intelligence and will; and that all the ordinary phenomena of the Universe are proximately due to these physical and mental forces, as constantly upheld and controlled by the Omnipresent wisdom and power of God. It is doubtful if any amount of argument could increase the all-but-universal conviction that the Theistic solution of this world and its events is the true one. It satisfactorily

accounts for all the facts of consciousness and observation, which Materialism cannot do. It satisfies the reason and the heart. It is so evidently true that none doubt it but those who do violence to their own innate convictions, and forcibly drag themselves into the snares and fogs of an infidel philosophy.

2. Materialism can only exist by a contradiction of Consciousness. The fundamental condition of all knowledge is a knowledge of self. Unless we are a self-conscious being we can not know either the phenomena that take place around us or within us. This knowledge of self is a knowledge that we are a real existence, an objective entity, an individual person, distinct from all others, possessed of intellect, sensibility and free will. This is a fundamental fact, a primal truth, the most essential condition of all knowledge, without which we can know nothing.

It is moreover a fact of consciousness that the body is not the Ego, the real self. We know as well as we can know anything, that there is a spirit dwelling in the body as in a house, which uses the body as a medium of communication with the external world. This Spirit is the self, the real I. Now these are not guesses, or mere theories, or arbitrary assumptions. They are facts of consciousness, universally known and admitted. All human speech and literature and conduct are a proof of it. "Even the Materialist himself cannot think or speak or write without assuming the existence of the mind as distinct from matter, any more than the Idealist can live and act without assuming the existence of the external world. The materialist cannot have any higher evidence or more reliable proof of the phenomena of which he makes so much, than he has of the existence of his own mind, afforded him by his consciousness. Neither can be denied except theoretically. As a matter of fact, every man, even the Materialist himself, believes both in matter and in mind. When he thinks and feels and wills he believes that he himself is an intelligent, feeling, willing being, distinct from matter when it is revealed to him by his senses. The one is as inevitable as the other. The belief in mind, therefore, is involved in the belief of Self-existence.

3. Materialism contradicts the facts of moral and religious consciousness. Nothing is more real or imperative in the experience of man. It is far easier to deny and reject the testimony of the senses than to deny the testimony of Conscience. No one can ever free himself from the inner voice, or from the sense of sin, or of accountability. This necessitates the belief in God to whom we must give an account. Neither Hume nor Paine, nor Voltaire, could permanently rid themselves of it, and it tortured their closing hours.

But Materialism, in repudiating all mind in man, leaves nothing to be accountable; and in repudiating the idea of God, leaves no Being to whom an account could be rendered. Plainly, in doing this, it does violence to our moral nature. To substitute "matter and force" for this personal, intelligent, holy, infinite, extra-mundane God, is to insult both Him and our own moral nature. Our Spiritual being revolts at such a theory, and instinctively declares it false. "It cannot be true unless our whole nature is a lie."

The logical sequences of their theory is something awful to contemplate. For, if the testimony of consciousness is not to be received with regard to our mental operations, neither can it be with regard to our sensations; therefore, if we have no valid evidence of mind, neither have we any evidence of matter. We would be driven to the conclusion that there is no matter and no mind, no

universe and no God. Everything would be swallowed up in the abyss of nothing. But for an illogical Materialist to see this is quite too much to expect!

4. Materialism contradicts the primary truths of reason. It is an intuitive truth of reason that every event must have an adequate cause. The cause must be of such a kind as can rationally satisfactorily account for the result. In nature we see everywhere evidence of thought, foresight, plan and purpose; but in the cause put forward by Materialism there is no thought or design, and no possibility of it. Now every man would recognize the absurdity of attributing all the works of human ingenuity and intellectual genius to a horse; but how much greater would be the absurdity of referring to blind, unintelligent, unthinking, lifeless force the stupendous, complicated and orderly works of God, stamped everywhere with evidences of His purpose, foresight and benevolent designs! Yet this is the very absurdity of which Materialism is guilty.

When this Godless theory would teach us that carbonic acid, water and ammonia with molecular forces, can produce all life from a fungus to man, our credulity halts. When Huxley intimates "that the existing world lay potentially in the cosmic vapor; and that then, a sufficient intelligence, could, from a knowledge of the properties of the molecules of that vapor, have predicted the state of the Fauna of Britain in 1869 with as much certainty as one can say what will happen to the vapor of the breath in a cold winter's day." We draw back from this daring monstrosity of speculation. It cannot be dignified with the name of reasoning; for it gives no rational account of the existence of "God's world," and the living, and thinking beings upon it. To tell us that a few molecules can produce man, with his libraries of thought and his heroic sacrifices and sublime devotions to duty, is to affront the common sense of mankind.

But still more, the Materialistic theory depends upon an endless series of phenomena or molecular causations, one thing causing another endlessly. Calm reason, however, decides that an infinite series of physical causes and effects is as unthinkable as a chain, infinite in length, and hanging on nothing.

Modern science has decided that spontaneous generation of life is an impossibility. Dead matter never becomes living, save as life reaches down from its upper sphere, and touches with its mystery, of vitality, the dead minerals and gases, and lifts them up transformed into the living sphere. Only so can dead matter ever know life. But here is a world full of life, and if dead matter can only be made alive by previously existing life, when and how did the "cosmic vapor" start this life? Evidently there must be a living Creator outside of matter, or life never could have begun. But this logically routs Materialism, and enthrones God.

5. Take the doctrine of the correlation of physical and vital and mental force, and their convertibility into one another. The Materialistic theory is that light and heat and electricity can be converted into life and thought, and the process can be reversed; the latter are identical with the former, and both classes are resolvable into the motion of molecules. Huxley avers, "It has been proved that every exercise of thought or feeling is attended with an evolution of heat, which shows that thought is resolved into heat. Can we longer doubt, then, that the brain, too, is a machine for the conversion of energy? Can we longer refuse to believe that thought is, in some mysterious way, correlated to the other natural forces?"

This may sound to some, and may seem to Materialists to be a masterly argument. That thought does increase the flow of blood to the brain and so increases its temperature may be admitted; but do their inferences at all follow, that light and heat are convertible into life and thought, and life and thought can be reverted into heat and light and electricity? Suppose that muscular power and nerve force are physical. What then? Who or what guides them and makes them work to a purposed end? Are heat and thought identical? "When ashamed we blush, when afraid we become pale. Does that prove that shame and fear and their bodily effects are one and the same thing? Does that prove that heat is shame, and shame heat, and that they can be converted into one another?" Even Tyndall tells the Materialists that when they have proved all they claim to prove they have proved nothing. The mind is still distinct from the matter of the body which it inhabits.

The whole civilized world is now distressed by the high price of food. If light and heat and electricity can be resolved into life, the people would gladly furnish Materialists the heat, if they will resolve it into live oxen and lessen the price of steaks. Even with all our literary activity, we would gladly furnish Materialists with any amount of physical force, if they will transmute it into the mental power of Shakespeare and produce some more Hamlets! The truth is, they cannot prove their theory by works. "Until scientific men," says Dr. Hodge, "can actually change heat and electricity into life, and go about raising the dead, men will be slow to believe that heat and life are identical; and until they can transmute physical force into intelligence and will, they cannot convert thinkers into Materialists." 1. Hodge, Vol. I, p. 295.

Professor Baker of Yale delivered a lecture to his students proving, as he thought, that vital force and thought are correlated to other natural forces. But he was compelled to give away the whole case of Materialism in the following closing words with which we will close this discussion.

"Is it only this? Is there not behind this material substance, a higher than molecular power in the thoughts which are immortalized in the poetry of a Milton or a Shakespeare, the art creations of a Michael Angelo, or a Titian, the harmonies of a Mozart or a Beethoven? Is there really no immortal portion separable from this brain-tissue, though yet mysteriously united to it? In a word, does this curiously fashioned body inclose a soul, God-given and to-God returning? Here science veils her face, and bows in reverence before the Almighty. We have passed the boundaries by which physical science is inclosed. No crucible, no subtle magnetic needle can answer now our questions. No word but His who formed us can break the awful silence. In the presence of such a revelation science is dumb, and faith comes in joyfully to accept that higher truth which can never be the object of physical demonstration." 2. Baker's Lecture, pp. 26, 27.

* * * * *

CHAPTER III -- ANTITHEISTIC THEORIES CONCLUDED

V. SECULARISM

Mr. Holyoake was the editor of *The Reasoner*, the organ of the Freethinkers of England. He was the acknowledged leader in the propagation of Secularism. With him was associated the famous Mr. Bradlaugh who was a more openly avowed atheist. Mr. Holyoake was more reserved and

timid, and assumed merely a skeptical position with regard to the divine existence. He did not deny, he only did not believe in the existence of God. This is also an epitome of Secularism.

Secularists do not absolutely deny the existence of God. They only assert that they have not sufficient evidence. Reason has not yet arrived at ample proof of His existence, nor can it absolutely deny it. Mr. Holyoake in his public debates and discussions maintained the following thesis: "We have not sufficient evidence to believe in the existence of a Supreme Being independent of Nature." So far from denying his existence, he made the following admission that "denying implies infinite knowledge as to the ground of disproof." He did not even hold that we cannot know or prove the existence of God, but that yet we have not proved it, and His existence is uncertain.

The natural, we may say, inevitable influence of such a theory could easily be foretold. Denying all satisfactory present knowledge of God, all satisfactory knowledge of a future existence goes with it. But this world with all its interests, and the present life, with all its urgent demands, we do know. This is certainly real; therefore it is the part of wisdom to be concerned with the present life. One world and one life at a time. Let us live this life while we have it, and get the best out of it. If there should be another world we will try to get our share of that when we get to it. If there is another-life hereafter we will live it when it comes.

Now this is practical, even though not avowed, Atheism. It tends directly to godless living. Putting the two worlds in the scales, the Secularist decides that the present world weighs much; the future world weighs little or nothing. He regards it as absurd for humanity to sacrifice any enjoyments or advantages on earth for any uncertain or imaginary interests "beyond the grave." God and a future state are so visionary that all faith in them, and concern about them are prejudicial to our present welfare. Therefore dismiss these visionary things from the mind, and give all thought and concern to the present life. "Is not all the talk about a life to come a jangle of vain words? The present is a reality, death a certainty, life a swiftly passing possession. They who enjoy know what they are getting. The rest is dismissed as altogether in the air" (R. A. Wilson in Expositor's Bible.)

Manifestly nothing could be more directly calculated to produce extreme worldliness and irreligion. And let it be understood that these views are not merely theories with these Secularists. They zealously propagate them. On our last visit to England we were informed that in the chief cities of Britain there were large Sabbath schools gathered in halls; in which there was neither a Bible nor a prayer. The lower and more unfortunate classes were here indoctrinated into a life without God, or religious duty, or thought of a future state. Professing to be friends of the poor, these Secularists play upon their unrest and discontent, and prejudices, and poison their minds against Christianity in the interest of Secularism!

It must be more atheistic in heart than in profession or it could not thus mislead and pervert the minds of the people. In a world of sin, with carnality pushing men on into self-indulgence and vice, and neglect of God, such a theory can be no help to the toiling masses. Dark indeed must be their lot when no prayer brings them a sense of nearness to the Most High, and no atoning and sin-pardoning Christ brings them peace with God, and His religion does not guide them into the practical and helpful virtues of Godliness, and no hope of blessedness in a future life gilds the clouds of sorrow and trouble that hang over this. If history proves anything, it proves that faith in

Jesus awakens high aims and purposes, preserves from vice and waste, inspires industry and economy, patience and hope, and, above all, opens the heart for the incoming of divine help. On the other hand, Atheism sets all these aside, encourages the incoming of vice and waste, and breeds discontent and despair. Secularism, like every other form of infidelity, is a snare and a curse to the people.

VI. AGNOSTICISM

T. H. Huxley (1825-1895) says: "I invented the title of Agnostic. It came into my head as suggestively antithetic to the 'gnostic' of church history, who professed to know so very much." Agnosticism means, 1. The doctrine that neither the nature nor existence of God, nor the ultimate character of the universe (that is, whether it is material or ideal) is knowable. This doctrine was formulated by Huxley to distinguish his position from Atheism, which positively rejects belief in His existence. 2. It means any doctrine which, while professing a belief in God's existence, denies to a greater or less extent, the knowableness of His nature. Thus Sir William Hamilton and Mansel held that man is compelled to believe in God's infinite being, though he is unable to comprehend it. Spencer's agnosticism is of this type, affirming, as it does, the existence of the unknowable.

These men severally speculated about the "Unconditional," the "Absolute," and the "Unknowable," in a peculiar way. Sir William Hamilton (1788-1856), denied to the unconditioned, and hence to the infinite and absolute, "Causal agency," as being a contradiction to the unconditional, He says: "A cause, exists absolutely under relation. Schelling has justly observed that 'he would deviate as wide as the poles from the idea of the absolute, who would think of defining its nature by the notion of activity.' But he who would define the absolute by the notion of cause would deviate still more widely from its nature; inasmuch as the notion of a cause involves not only a determination to activity, but of a determination to a particular, nay, a dependent, kind of activity-an activity not imminent but transient."

In other words Schellirig's absolute God cannot have activity, and Hamilton's unconditioned God cannot cause anything.

Mansel, (1820-1871), is the expositor of Hamilton, and more fully sets forth the implications of his doctrine of the unconditioned as contradictory to the divine personality. He says: "To conceive the Deity as he is, we must conceive Him as First Cause, as absolute and as Infinite. By the First Cause is meant that which produces all things, and is itself produced by none. By the Absolute is meant that which exists in and by itself, having no necessary relation to any other Being. By the Infinite is meant that which is free from all possible limitation; that than which a greater is inconceivable; and which, consequently, can receive no additional attribute or mode of existence, which it had not from all eternity." " 'What kind of an Absolute Being is that,' says Hegel, 'which does not contain in itself all that is actual, even evil included?' We may repudiate the conclusion with indignation; but the reasoning is unassailable." "A cause cannot, as such, be absolute, the Absolute cannot, as such, be a cause. How can the Infinite become that which it was not from the first? If causation is a possible mode of existence, that which exists without causing is not infinite; that which becomes a cause has passed beyond its former limits."¹ "The very conception of a moral nature is in itself the conception of a limit, for morality is compliance with a law; and a law, whether imposed from within or from without, can only be conceived to operate by limiting the

range of possible actions." "The only human conception of personality is that of limitation."¹ 1. Limits of Religious Thought, p. 127.

It will be seen from the above quotations that Mansel's "Absolute, infinite, unconditioned God," is a First Cause who causes nothing, has no morality, and no personality. What logic!

Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) writes in a similar strain and with as little consistency. He says: "Those who espouse this alternative position-of an ultimate personal cause-make the erroneous assumption that the choice is between personality and something lower than personality; whereas the choice is rather, between personality and something higher. Is it not just possible that there is a mode of being as much transcending intelligence and will as these transcend mechanical motion? It is true we are not able to conceive of any such higher mode of being. But this is not a reason for questioning its existence; it is rather the reverse."²

Then he descants on "the impiety of the pious" who meanly worship God as a person, instead of reverently worshiping the Unknowable Absolute! And yet he admits that toleration of the "impious" creeds is a duty because "these various beliefs are parts of the constituted order of things; and not accidental but necessary parts. We cannot avoid the inference that they are needful accompaniments of human life. From the highest point of view we must recognize them as modes of manifestation of the Unknowable; and as having this for their warrant."³ 2. First Principles, p. 109. 3. First Principles, pp. 121, 122

How kind of Spencer to admit that faith in a personal God is necessary, and the impiety of it may be pardoned!

Again he goes on, telling us how to think of the First Cause: "It must be independent. If it is not independent it cannot be the First Cause, for that must be the First Cause on which it depends. . . . But to think of the First Cause as totally independent, is to think of it as that which exists in the absence of all other existences. Not only, however, must the First Cause be a form of being which has no necessary form of being, but it can have no necessary relation within itself. There can be nothing in it which determines change, and yet nothing which prevents change. For if it contains something which imposes such necessities or restraints, this something must be a cause higher than the First Cause, which is absurd. Thus the First Cause must be in every sense perfect, complete, total; including within itself all power, and transcending all law. Or to use the established word, it must be absolute."¹ 1. First Principles, p. 38.

Truly we have in the above a specimen of sublime logic! Spencer's First Cause exists in the absence of all other existence; and nothing without could impel it to create any other existences; and also nothing within it could "determine" it to do it. Yet the Universe is full of finite existences. No existence could be treated without action. All action must be either spontaneous or necessary, and Spencer denies to his Absolute both forms of action. How then did all these finite existences come to be? We will have him to answer.

Mansel was equally lame in logic when he tried to show that God could not be thought of as a Cause, because as Cause it must be related to effects. He cannot, then, be Creator, because as such there must be a relation between God and the world, and He is Unrelated.

What then, we may ask, is the God of these peculiar agnostic philosophers? Bringing their adjectives together in one comprehensive sentence we truthfully answer: Their God is an "infinite," "unknowable," "unthinkable," "inscrutable," "unrelated," "unconditioned," "impersonal," "absolute," somewhat "without activity," "without morality," and "without personality."

But what is this strange being or thing? Oh, we must not expect to know; we cannot know for he, rather it, is unknowable. But we may be permitted to guess or surmise that this being or thing must be "a bulk God, of infinite magnitude, filling all space" and doing nothing. "If there were such an absolute existence, so unrelated that it could neither cause nor create anything it would be a dead existence," as substantial and as worthless to man as an imaginary ray of moonshine. 2 2. Miley: Vol. I, p. 143.

And after all this erratic and dreary speculation about the unthinkable and unknowable and unrelated Absolute, Spencer closes his philosophizings with this delightful contradiction of all his agnosticism: "Amid the mysteries which become the more mysterious the more they are thought about, there will remain one absolute certainty that man is ever in presence of an Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed."

We might be permitted to ask how he arrived at such "absolute certainty" about the "unthinkable and unknowable"? Justice Stephen of U. S. Supreme Court, reviewing him said, "Mr. Spencer's conclusion appears to me to have absolutely no meaning at all. It is so abstract that it asserts nothing. It is like a gigantic soap-bubble, not burst, but blown thinner and thinner until it has become imperceptible." 1 1. Nineteenth Century, June, 1884.

Answers

There is manifestly an escape from the philosophical absurdities of these agnostics. Whatever were their purposes in writing (and they differed widely), their theories naturally lead to pantheism or atheism. A being such as they describe, an "unrelated, unknowable somewhat, without activity, morality or personality," makes no appeal, and is of no earthly account, to the man in the street who works for two dollars a day.

In answer to them we reply.

I. They have lost themselves in hair-splitting, philosophical jugglings about the terms, "Absolute," and "Infinite." Their definitions are erroneous, and their inferences false and fatal. There is no such infinite or absolute, as their philosophy describes,-an "infinite, unrelated, space-filling bulk" without activity, or personality. It is no immediate truth of the reason or requirement of the mind. It exists only in their nebulous speculation. "If the absolute be that which is incapable of all relation, then it must be alone; nothing but the Absolute can be actual or possible. Then it can neither know or be known. And if the infinite be all, then, there can be no finite." 2 2. Miley: Vol. I, pp. 14S, 146.

When a definition leads to such contradictions and absurdities, the only rational conclusion is that it is wrong, a mess of nonsense!

Martineau well says of Mansel: "If we take the words 'Absolute' and 'Infinite' to mean that he to whom they are applicable chokes up the universe, mental and physical, and prevents the existence of everyone else, then it is nonsense and clear contradiction for any one conscious of his own existence to use them of God at all." 2 2. Miley: Vol. I, pp. 14S, 146.

There is, there can be, no such Infinite, Absolute Being. But when we apply these adjectives to a personal God, there is no logical contradiction. It means a personal God with attributes of absolute, infinite perfection. Why may not the Absolute Being be a self-conscious Person? To deny this would be to deny to Him one of the perfections which even finite beings may have. Would the Divine Person, "who filleth the heavens with his glory and whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain" be less in an attribute, than a mere space-filling thing, "without activity, morality or personality"} The meanest moral being that walks the earth is greater and more important than a universe of dirt. Field very wisely says: "Matthew Arnold's, 'The Eternal not ourselves that makes for righteousness,' is but a clumsy attempt to avoid, by the skilful use of words; the recognition of God as a person; for how can a mere influence, an abstract non-intelligence, make for anything, whether righteousness or unrighteousness? 1 1. Handbook of Christian Theology, p. 20

Our conclusion is, Agnostics are not going to get a personal God Almighty out of His Universe by false definitions, and fog-banks of talk about the unknowable, Infinite and Absolute.

II. God can be known. He is not an unthinkable, unknowable being. Our Lord said: "This is eternal life that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." Isaiah predicts, "The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord" (Isa. 11: 9). Paul says that even the heathen knew God, but did not like to retain that knowledge (Rom. 1: 19, 21, 28).

A. Negatively.

1. This does not mean that we can know every thing about God. It takes the Infinite One to Know all about Himself.

2. It does not mean that He can be comprehended. To comprehend is to have exhaustive knowledge. It means to know an object in all its qualities and relations. We do not know electricity or vital force, or the most common things about us in that sense. God is past finding out. Knowledge, however can be real, when it is not complete. We may know a railroad engine, even though we do not know its horse-power, or speed, or weight, or its cost, or its maker, or how long it has been used, or how long it will last, or many other facts about it. Yet our knowledge of the engine is real knowledge. And as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are God's ways higher than our ways and "past finding out," and "His" thoughts are higher than our thoughts." Yet still we know that He is a personal, thinking, willing, feeling, loving, holy Being. We "know only in part," but we do know God.

B. Positively. We can know God.

1. By the natural working of our own minds. We intuitively think of Him as the First Cause, and refer to Him every attribute manifested in His works. We are His children, and creation, and

consequently, we are like Him. We, therefore, ascribe to Him all the rational and moral attributes of our own natures, exalted to an infinite degree. If we are like God, He is like us. This is precisely the argument Paul made on Mars' Hill to the Athenians. It is incomparably more rational than the hazy speculations of the Agnostics. He said; "Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device." In like manner we should conclude, that He is not a mere spatial being, "unthinkable" and "unknowable," "without parts or qualities or personality," a mere abstraction, - a name for the order of the Universe, - an "inscrutable force." If we are his children, He is our Father, attributes we share, and of whose nature we partake.

Hamilton, in his speculations, arrived at this absurd conclusion: "The last and highest consecration of all true religion must be an altar: 'To the unknown and unknowable God.'¹ If this were true, then St. Paul should have been instructed by the idolatrous Athenians, instead of preaching to them. Manifestly the great Apostle had not attained to this high agnosticism. In his sermon there was not a word about an "unthinkable infinite," or an "absolute, spacefilling blank," or an "inactive, inscrutable force," that could not be "started to action by anything outside of itself or within itself"! He preached to them about a personal God, Creator and Lord of all, whose offspring we are.² He preached good sense. 1. Hamilton: Discussions, p. 22. 2. Miley: Vol. I, pp. 152, 153, and Acts 17: 22-31.

2. It is the law of our nature to think in this way. The heathen have thought in this way. In all forms of polytheism, the gods of the people have been magnified human beings, with intelligence and personality. Such thinking would have been correct, if they had thought of one only God, as a spiritual being, infinite in all attributes.

We know that we are led to think of God in this way. We have a firm conviction that God is what he has revealed Himself to be in our intuitions, and in His manifestations of Himself; just as we believe the external world is real, as we take it to be. The foundation of our confidence is our faith in the veracity of consciousness, and the laws of belief which God has impressed upon our nature. Philosophers explain away both the external world and God; but the common sense of mankind holds fast to its primal beliefs, undisturbed by these speculations.

3. Our moral nature demands this idea of God. Men are conscious of their accountability to a superior being, who knows the character and conduct of men, and who has the purpose and the power to reward or punish them according to their desert. Therefore, we cannot help concluding that the God who reveals himself in our nature, is a moral being like ourselves, who thinks and wills and acts; who rewards and punishes. That is, He is a person, with moral attributes, -intellect, sensibility and free-will. This revelation of God must be true, and we can know what God is, or our own nature is an organized falsehood.

4. Our religious nature witnesses to such a God.

Man has the instinct of worship. To worship means to express our gratitude for blessings, and to acknowledge our dependence, and to pray for the continuance of loving favors, to thank, and pray and praise and adore.

But who prays to space-filling, dead matter? Who praises the winds or clouds? Who loves "inscrutable force"? Our religious nature demands for its object of worship a Being like ourselves only infinitely exalted: one who knows our needs, and sympathizes with us in our sorrows, and forgives our sins,-one who can hear our confessions and praises and prayers; who can know and be known; who can love and be loved. There must be such a Being for us to worship, or our nature is an unaccountable deception.

5. The results of the opposing theories make them naturally abhorrent to the mind. If we are not warranted in referring to God the attributes of our own nature, then practically we have no God. An "unknown" and "unknowable" and "unrelated" God is to us no God, a veritable nothing. Says Dr. Hodge: "It is a historical fact that those who reject this method of forming our idea of God, who deny that we are to refer to Him the perfections of our own nature, have become atheists. They take the word 'spirit' and strip from it consciousness, intelligence, will and morality; and the residue, which is 'blank nothing,' they call God."¹ 1. Hodge: Vol. I, p. 343.

6. Creation and Providence reveal such a personal God. We must refer to a cause such attributes as are necessary to fully account for the effects. If the effects manifest intelligence, will, power, and moral excellence, they must belong to the cause. If the effects are infinitely vast in extent, and extended in time then there must be an Infinite Moral Being, impressing His personality upon all His works.

7. The Scriptures fully support such a conception of God. He ascribes to himself the perfections of our nature in an infinite degree. He lives, acts, creates, thinks, reasons, wills, feels, loves and hates, like ourselves. "We are self-conscious; so is God. We are spirits; so is He. We are voluntary agents; so is God. We have a moral nature, though it is marred by sin; God has moral excellence in infinite perfection. We are persons; so is God, ... He is our ruler and Father, with whom we can commune. His favor is our life, and His loving kindness better than life. This sublime revelation of God in His own nature and His relation to us is no delusion. It makes God known to us as He really is. We therefore know God, although no creature can understand the Almighty unto perfection."¹ "The theory, therefore of Hamilton and Mansel as to the knowledge of God is suicidal. It is inconsistent with the veracity of consciousness, which is the fundamental principle of their philosophy. . . . God has not so constituted our nature as to make it of necessity deceptive. The senses, reason and conscience, within their appropriate spheres, and in their normal exercise, are trustworthy guides. Their combined spheres comprehend all the relations in which we, as rational creatures, stand to the external world, to our fellow men and to God." 1. Hodge: Vol. I, pp. 344, 345.

Miley's conclusion is: "There is no such Infinite as this agnosticism maintains; no demand for it in reason; no proof of its existence; no use for it in the universe. Most of all is God not such an Infinite, God, the true Infinite, is a personal being, with the attributes of personality, in absolute perfection. The essential attributes of all personality, intellect, sensibility and will, are realities known in our own consciousness. That these attributes are infinite in God does not render them unthinkable or unknowable. Through his moral government and providential agency, God is truly know-able. . . . When the false Infinite is replaced with the true, the personal God, the Infinite is manifestly, thinkable and knowable."² 2. Miley: Vol. I, pp. 154, 155.

Field well says: "The conclusion appears inevitable, that the First Cause of all things must be personal, that there is behind ourselves and all things that we see and know, a Mind, a Reason, a Will, like our own only incomparably greater. The evidence of this is seen in the works of nature, in the common consent of mankind, is felt in man's inner consciousness, and in his sense of moral accountability. The God of the Scriptures, and the First Cause of true science are One!"^{3 3}. Field's Handbook of Theology, p. 22,

* * * * *

PART II -- THEOLOGY

CHAPTER I -- BEING AND PERSONALITY OF GOD

It has been a mooted question whether the Being of God can be defined. If to define necessarily means to state all His qualities and attributes, manifestly no creature can exhaustively name all that God is.

But to define means, also, simply to bound or distinguish so far that the thing defined may be discriminated from all other things.

When we say that we can define God, all that is meant is, that we can state the class of beings to which He belongs, and the attributes by which He is distinguished from all other things.

The words attribute, property, quality, faculty, power, are used popularly much in the same sense. But speaking critically, the words property and quality are used of matter; the words faculties and powers are used of the human mind, and the word attributes is used of God.

The Being of God

Attributes must have a ground in essential being. Qualities are neither possible nor thinkable as separate facts, unrelated to anything. "For both thought and reality, body is more than its properties, mind more than its faculties, God more than His attributes." Reason decides that there must be a something to which the properties belong, a mind which possesses the faculties, a Divine Being which has the attributes.

Being and attributes are inseparable in reality. Neither can exist without the other. Matter must have weight, inertia, length, breadth, etc.; so the qualities-weight, inertia, length and breadth-cannot be qualities of nothing. They must belong to something- matter. So in the very being of God are all His attributes, and without them He would not be God.

Yet, in discussion, we must separate the being of God from His attributes, in the interest of clear thought. Only so is a classification of God's attributes possible. By being is meant that which has real substantive existence, that is, a substance or an essence. Reason gets this notion from our own consciousness. We are conscious of self as the subject of the thoughts, feelings and volitions of the mind. It is impossible to think of thoughts and feelings, unless there is a self-a being that thinks and

feels. We cannot think of our own actions, unless we assume that there is a something in us, a substance, an essence, a being that acts.

When philosophers tell us that the mind is only a series of acts and states, and matter is nothing but force, they violate the very fundamental principles of human reasoning. It is equivalent to saying that a nonentity, a nothing, can produce effects. When therefore we say that there is a God, we do not assert merely that there is in our minds the idea of such a Being; but that there is such a real Being, whether we think it or not. He actually exists, independently of our thought.

When we define God as, "A Spirit, infinite, eternal, unchangeable, in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth," we mean that there is an Infinite Spirit who is Eternal and unchangeable, who is wise and good and holy and just. And it follows, logically, that if this Essence, this Being is eternal and unchangeable, then He existed before and independent of the world. Also this Being is distinct from the world.

And moreover we define God as a Spirit on rational grounds. An attribute or a quality requires a subject answering in kind to its own distinctive quality. We may say a stone is gray in color, round, in shape, heavy in weight, and hard, etc. These adjectives must be applied to an appropriate thing. So only a Spirit can have the attributes which we by rational compulsion, apply to God. The divine attributes-wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth-must belong only to a Spiritual being.

We can not explain the universal conceptions of the race about God as a Spirit on any other ground. It is a strong proof that there is such a Being. The arguments of Theism proved the divine existence; but they equally proved the divine spirituality.

Reason calmly affirms that a self-acting will of infinite power can only account for this world and the universe around it. And there is so much indication of thought and foresight, and design and purpose, and adaptation in every thing created, that reason affirms it is all the work of an infinite intelligence.

Reason notes the spiritual faculties of man, his sublime intellect ranging through the universe, weighing planets, and calculating eclipses, transits and conjunctions, and investigating the constitution of the most distant stars, his sensibilities delicately responsive to thought and keenly alive to joy and sorrow, and his lordly will possessing the throne of self-sovereignty and controlling the life under the moral guidance of conscience; reason notes all this and decides that only an Infinite Divine Mind could create such a human mind. Man himself is conclusive proof of a moral and spiritual personality in the Infinite author of his being.

Reason is true to itself and does not go astray when it decides that the Divine Mind is the original of the human mind, because the moral and spiritual nature of God is demanded by the moral and spiritual nature in man.

And may not reason take a step or two farther and still walk on firm ground? It reaches the conclusion that if there is no Divine Spiritual Being, then we have no God at all. Materialism as we have seen, in whatever form it appears, leads to atheism. Pantheism, with its hypothetical

"infinite thought and infinite extension," affords no happier solution of the universe. It utterly falls short of God as demanded by the human mind. "Infinite thought" has no meaning apart from an Infinite Thinker. No mere force, even though omnipotent, can answer to the demands of the human soul. Force must be guided by intelligence and conscience. For sensitive beings with the affectional nature of man, there must be somewhere in the universe a sympathetic Father, and Infinite Goodness, a God of love.

And he must be immutable. That such a Being as reason demands, should be changeable in His essence is quite unthinkable. "With any change in His essential being he could not be the true and eternal God." We are told that there is no proof of any change even in the essence of matter. The unity of consciousness and the persistence of personal identity through the extremest changes of the longest and most varied life, seem to be conclusive proof against any change in the essence of the human Spirit. And what is true of the human Spirit must be profoundly true of the absolutely perfect Divine Spirit. So reason firmly declares that God is immutable in his essential being.

And that such a being should change in character, that He should lay aside His goodness, or cast off His virtue, or be unjust, or untruthful, or unholy, is alike offensive to reason, as it thinks about God. For such reasons we conclude, not only that there is a God, but also that "God is a Spirit, infinite, Eternal, and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth."

Here the mind rests. Here reason is satisfied. Such a God is amply able to create the Universe and be the Father of our spirits. We are His offspring. Now the question arises, will He make a special revelation of Himself to man?

* * * * *

CHAPTER II -- DIVINE REVELATION

Will such a God as reason demands reveal himself in any special way to man? All who accept Theism must believe in the (possibility of such revelation as we need to have. A God of infinite wisdom and power surely can reveal himself in some way that will be satisfactory to us.

By divine revelation we mean a supernatural communication of truth from God to man. By supernatural is meant beyond the flight of nature or reason. Men who oppose the Bible and reject Christianity, oppose the doctrine of a revelation from God as unnecessary, and improbable and impossible. All true theists to be consistent must take the other side.

I. Revelation is necessary.

Modern infidels have been loud in their assertions that the light of nature is sufficient to conduct mankind to truth and virtue and happiness. But it is infidels in Christian lands who say this,- infidels who have always dwelt in the light of the Bible they reject, and in the moral environment made by the Christianity which they despise. It is easy to test this by considering what has been the life of those ages and nations where the truths of revelation had not come, and the light of the gospel did not shine.

Very fair systems of Natural Theology can be, and have been framed in Christian lands by opponents of Christianity; but some of their best views have been derived not from their own unassisted reasons, but, as Rousseau himself confesses, from those very Scriptures which they despise and revile, from their early education, and from living in a country where, in spite of themselves, everybody's thinking, their own with the rest, is leavened by the Gospel.

Let it be understood, we are not considering now what views of God seem reasonable to Christian men in a Christian land. We are considering what depraved and fallen men needed in this world before God made His revelation to it, and what is needed now where it has never come.

Bear in mind also that, though man is fallen, he still retains a nature inclined to religion, and a distinct capacity for it. "Indeed," says President Mark Hopkins, "no fact can be better established, both by philosophy and history, than that mankind are so constituted that they must have some religion. Man has a religious nature, which is a fundamental and necessary and elementary constituent of his being. This nature will manifest itself. Let the true religion be removed, and a false one will come in its place."

Now as a historical fact, this rational being, this child of God, with his capacity for religion, lost this moral image, and consequently the true knowledge of God. As "he did not like to retain the knowledge of God," under the influence of his depravity, his "foolish heart was darkened," and he went off into Pantheism and , every form of degrading idolatry. Now can such a being, lost in sin, get back to God without a direct revelation? He has never done it.

This is confirmed by an appeal to facts. "An impartial survey of the condition of those portions of the earth that have been without the light of revelation, shows conclusively that the reformation of man was hopeless without it. A full and fair experiment has been made. It has been extended through thousands of years, and ample time has been given to test every principle, to follow out every tendency to its results, to call forth every inherent energy of man. It has been made in every climate, under every form of government, in all circumstances of barbarism and refinement, by individuals who, for intellectual endowments, have been the pride of the race, and by nations who have made the greatest advancement in science, in literature, and in the arts. What unassisted man has done therefore, to disperse the religious darkness, and to remedy the moral maladies of the world, may be regarded as a fair exemplification of what he would do. After so long and fair a trial, it is extremely probable that the race would have continued to be hopelessly benighted and degraded without a direct revelation from God."1 1. Mark Hopkins, "Evidences of Christianity," p. 49

That such an authoritative revelation was necessary will appear from the following considerations.

1. Human reason was insufficient to speak with due authority to men. "Among those who professed to be guided by it, some worshiped the true God, some His works, some their own works, and some no God at all, though all ages had the same book of nature, and the same reason from which to derive moral rules." Reason, once fallen into sin, did not speak with authority, but only speculated.

2. Knowledge of Divine Unity was lost. The mass of men became worshipers of natural objects, or of the powers of nature personified, or of idols, or of deified men and women. If a few philosophers saw the folly of this, and really held to the Divine Unity, it was rather to ridicule and despise than to help the multitude. It does not appear, however, that they held to the doctrine, except as a matter of speculation, or that they had any habit of worshiping one infinite God, or taught that He ought to be worshiped. What must have been the practical blindness and uncertainty of the common mind, on this all-important subject, when Socrates one of the clearest minded of all the ancient philosophers, could make a dying request of a friend, that he sacrifice a cock for him to Esculapius? If that noble and immortal man had reached no firmer ground of faith in God, where must the common herd have been?

3. The heathen nations lost the knowledge of God, as a holy God. Somehow reason failed to bring them back to the simple conception of the Divine Being as a perfect moral character, exercising a righteous moral government over the entire universe, and taking notice even of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Without such a knowledge of God there can be no pure and spiritual religion.

Generally, the ancients transferred to God the moral character, the affections, the passions and even the lusts, of men.

Whether their reasons might not have attained to a better knowledge of God we will not positively affirm. We think they might, Paul seemed to think so. But the fact is, they did not; and God acted upon the fact.

4. The loss of the conception of God's holiness induced a separation of religion and morality. There was an abundance of religion in the ancient heathen world, as there is in the modern; but it did not lead to purity of life.

Paul's Epistle to the Romans bears awful testimony to the fact. "Heathen writers themselves also confirm the charge. They testify that the greatest crimes were countenanced by the arguments and examples of their moralists and philosophers. Infanticide, theft, and crimes against nature, the detail of which modesty forbids, were not only tolerated but even enjoined by their legislators and praised by their poets. This would not have been, had not public opinion consented to, and in some measure, invited them.

"Even their religions sanctioned gross vices. In Corinth was a temple of Venus with a thousand female votaries bringing to her treasury the gains of their impurity. The Babylonians had a temple to which every virgin was religiously taught to resort for unchaste purposes. Plato taught that to lie was honorable. Cicero pleads for fornication and commends, and at length practices, suicide. Cato, extolled as a model of virtue, was guilty of prostitution and drunkenness, and advocated and finally practiced, self murder." 1. Binney and Steele's Theological Compend., pp. 15, 16.

Is the modern heathen world any better? Bishop Heber said of the Modern Hindus, "I have never met with a race of men whose standard of morality is so low, -who feel so little apparent shame in being detected in a falsehood, or so little interest in the sufferings of a neighbor not being of their own caste or family, -whose ordinary and familiar conversation is so licentious, or in the wilder and more lawless districts, who shed blood with so little repugnance."

Says Mark Hopkins: "The tendency to this separation of morals and religion is strong everywhere, and nothing can be more destructive both of true religion and morality, or more fatal to every interest of man. . . How much more must this be the case, when the character of the object worshiped is such as to excite and encourage every form of iniquity, and drunkenness and obscenity, instead of being forbidden, become a part of religious rites! 'When the light that is in men becomes darkness, how great is that darkness!' This is a point of the greatest moment, since no false religion ever did, or ever can, teach, and adequately sanction, anything like a perfect system of morality." 2. Hopkins, "Evidences of Christianity," pp. SI, 52.

5. Men had lost all sure and certain knowledge of the immortality of the soul. Philosophers threw across the grave the frail bridge of speculation, but left the question debatable and doubtful. Some regarded this belief as only a vulgar prejudice. Even Cicero, who had carefully studied the arguments of Socrates, and added others of his own, said, "Which of these is true, God alone knows; and which is most probable, a very great question." As a practical power in human lives, it may be truthfully said, that "Christ brought life and immortality to light through His gospel."

Now it is barely possible that reason, put to its utmost stretch of power, might have reached these truths—the unity of God, His holiness, the duty of morality, and, the immortality of the Soul, just as Newton and Euclid might have reached unaided the highest mathematical truths; but they never would have been known by the great mass of mankind.

There are, however, still other truths greatly needed, that nature does not teach, and reason could not discover.

1. The truth that God can pardon sin. The unaided mind of man never would have been clear about it. Natural religion teaches that God is sternly just. How a just God could possibly pardon sin was a problem that the greatest minds wrestled with in vain. The difficulty seemed so great to Socrates that he said to his disciple, "Crito, I do not see how God can possibly forgive sin, for I do not see that He ought to." Even modern theologians, who get befogged about the atonement, begin to deny that sin is ever forgiven. Many Universalists tell us that the due punishment of every sin must be borne, and there is no escape. Now to a race of sinners, it was indispensable that this fact should be known before any rational system of religion could be framed. Conjectures here would not lead to practical salvation.

2. On what grounds could God forgive sin? Even if somehow the impression became lodged in the mind that the Divine Being would forgive sin, we would still need to know the conditions of the pardon.

Modern deists tell us, especially Lord Herbert, that it is a dictate of natural religion that God will pardon sin on repentance. Nothing is farther from the truth. No heathen religion ever taught any thing of the kind. "Having the light of the Bible, we see distinctly that God can not properly pardon the guilty without repentance, meaning a thorough forsaking of sin even in the secret feelings of the heart; but who ever heard of such a repentance in other religions? And who ever heard of a deist exercising such a repentance and remaining a deist? . . . The truth is, deists have borrowed this

partial truth from the Bible, and then used it to show that we do not need the book from which they borrowed it." 1. Hopkins, "Evidences of Christianity, pp. 54, SS.

3. Furthermore, if a man should endeavor to reclaim himself from the dominion of sin he could not know by himself whether God would encourage him or put obstacles in his way. The foreboding of conscience would deter reason from conjecturing that there was gracious help, divine aid for the sinful and the tempted, so sustaining to the weakness, and so consoling to the wretchedness, of man, coming directly from a personal God. The grace in Christ Jesus, that we hear so much about in Christendom, is utterly unthought of in heathen lands.

4. Without revelation man could not know either his origin or his destiny. How we came to be, or why we are here, or what is the purpose of our existence, or the end of our journey,-what mists of darkness hang over it all, apart from the blessed light of revelation!

"Now, when we consider the passions of men, the collisions of interests, the obtrusiveness of the objects of sense, the pressure of animal wants, the vices of society, and the shortness of life, who can believe, with this total darkness resting upon others, that one man in a million would sit down calmly to solve these great questions respecting God and His government, and human destiny?" 1 And who can believe for a moment that any merely speculative solution of these questions would have sufficient power to control the passions and predominate over the senses, and produce a religion that could save men? No; it is exceedingly clear that, if anything was to be done to enlighten man, it must be by a voice from heaven, a voice that could speak with the authority of Eternal Truth. 1. Hopkins, "Evidences of Christianity," p. 56.

Moral darkness, voluntarily incurred, always and necessarily involves practical wickedness. Falsehood, cruelty, selfishness and nameless licentiousness enveloped humanity like an all pervading atmosphere. Men found themselves, therefore, in this dilemma. They had lost the true knowledge of God. But they could not annihilate their religious faculty; they must still have a religion. Therefore superstition, fanaticism, pantheism and idolatry, united with every gross form of sin, came in to make still darker their darkened hearts, and still more depraved their wicked lives. Manifestly a voice from heaven must speak or humanity is lost forever.

II. Is a revelation probable?

Here is the issue: Granted a Personal God in the universe, and a race of moral beings created in His image and lost in sin, will He take steps for their recovery?"

1. Yes; if He has the heart of a Father, He will be concerned about the fate of His children. Any true father would seek a lost child. Surely the Infinite Father will seek billions of His lost children, will break the awful silence that surrounds them, and speak with a voice of love the message that is necessary for their present and eternal wellbeing.

2. Yes; if He is a God of infinite goodness, He who cares for all the sentient beings he has made, and "openeth His hand and satisfieth the wants of every living thing," who notes the sparrow's fall, and ministers to all life, will surely care for the souls of His immortal children. He will not feed

and clothe the bodies of men, and ignore the dire needs of that part of their nature that endures forever.

3. Yes; if God is a holy God. He must hate sin with an infinite hatred. All the impulses of His infinite heart must be against it. The forces of His government must be arrayed in opposition to it. Whatever His wisdom can suggest and His love prompt, and His power execute will be put in operation to counteract sin. It is the nature of holiness to desire in every other moral being a resemblance to itself, and to hold sinfulness, wherever it exists, in utter abhorrence. So we may conclude that God wishes us to be holy like Himself, and, to that end, will be impelled by His own nature, to give us every proper assistance. It is inconceivable that a being of infinite wisdom and power should will a moral end, and then not put forth all proper moral means essential to that end.

4. Yes; if our race is as important as we suppose it to be. We are a race of sentient beings capable of bliss or woe, and that forever. No finite mind in all the universe can remotely comprehend the possible aggregate of the blessedness or misery of one single soul in a career of endless duration. But multiply, this by the uncounted billions of immortals who have lived, and will live in this world, and there will be an amount that staggers reason to even contemplate. Only the Infinite Mind can comprehend this problem.

Surely, if a case ever could occur in the universe, in which we might infer from the wisdom and holiness and benevolence of an infinite Heavenly Father, that he would make a special revelation of himself, this is that case. On the fact of such an interposition hung the destiny of our race; and to one who could conceive of the possibility of mercy in God, it could not appear improbable that such an interposition would be made.

This probability is, also, greatly strengthened by the fact that the race has generally expected such a revelation, and the readiness which they have shown to receive it, and the natural tendency of man to crave and welcome divine help.

III. Is a Divine Supernatural Revelation Possible?

Many infidels say "no." But even Bolingbroke admitted that, "An extraordinary action of God upon the human mind is not more inconceivable than the ordinary action of mind on body, or of body on mind."

What is the nature of the impossibility of a revelation? Does it lie in God? Cannot the Creator, who had power enough to create moral beings in his own image, discover or invent some way of revealing himself to them? If a father can invent a telephone and speak to his child hundreds of miles away and even his voice be recognized, can not the Infinite Father somehow send a message and make his voice known to man? Surely by signs, miracles, audible voice, visions, inspiration, or something of the kind, a message can be sent which shall get through to the soul and be understood. If President Hoover can send a message by radio to the people of the United States, cannot God speak to the people of the world?

Is the impossibility in man? Has He not, with all His wonderful complement of faculties, spiritual perception and moral discernment enough to know when God is near, and apprehend what He is

trying to reveal? To doubt it is to cast reflections upon man, and to degrade Him to the level of the brute.

* * * * *

CHAPTER III -- THEN MIRACLES

Theists believe in the existence of a personal God, intelligent and free,-not a God who is a part of nature, but one who is as distinct from nature, as the builder of the house, who lives in it, is distinct from the house. Phillips Brooks said, "The laws of nature are the hands of God, executing His will." Our best philosophers hold that the laws of nature are only the customary mode in which God operates; and that all nature, with all its laws, is perfectly under His control. Whoever holds such a belief will find no difficulty in believing that such a God may at any time, when the good of His creatures requires it, change the mode of His operations, and suspend those laws.

But this to man is a miracle. By a miracle, we may understand, in the strict theological sense, a direct interposition of God's power, changing or suspending temporarily the operation of an established law of nature, for the purpose of revealing Himself or His truth to men. It has been defined, also, as "God's credentials given to His servants, whom He has sent to reveal His will."

I. There are shallow and illogical theologians in these days who sneer at miracles, and vainly dream that they can hold to their Christianity without them. One of them says, (I will not name him), "Rationalism is the antithesis of all systems which depend on authority as the source of truth. Modern thinkers reject the strictly miraculous everywhere. Hence they reject the authority of the Scriptures. The Incarnation is totally unintelligible. . . . With the incarnation will also disappear the doctrine of the Trinity and the Atonement."

Another says: "Higher Criticism has destroyed the story of the Virgin Birth as a historic record. The same is true of almost every so-called incident in the Synoptic Gospels. It is impossible to regard as historical the Temptation, the Transfiguration, the cleansing of the Temple, and the numerous miracle incidents with which they are filled; and if there is no other way of reading them than as historical facts, then they must go on the rubbish heap of the world."

The above specimens are as bold infidelity as was ever uttered by Hume or Ingersoll, and yet they came from living Doctors of Divinity. God have mercy on the churches who allow them to preach, and the Educational Institutions who allow them to teach!

Our old teacher, Dr. G. P. Fisher of Yale, says: "Doubt or denial of the possibility of miracles results from an untheistic conception of nature, and the relation of nature to God. Or, if the personality of God is recognized, He is conceived of as exterior to the world, either a passive spectator or acting upon it from without. . . . When it is understood that God, transcendent and personal though He be, is likewise immanent in nature, and that nature and the interaction of its parts are dependent on His unceasing energy, the difficulty vanishes. Science, no more than religion, warrants us in assuming the existence of "forces" in nature, which form an independent totality." 1. Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief, pp. 16S, 166.

In the same spirit, Lotze says: "The whole course of nature becomes intelligible only by supposing the coworking of God, who alone carries forward the reciprocal action of the different parts of the world. But that view which admits a life of God that is not benumbed in an unchangeable sameness . . . shows how a miracle may take place without any disturbance elsewhere of the constancy of nature . . . with the consequence that its orderly movement goes on unhindered."

"Were the vision not clouded, the ordinary sequences of nature, its wise and beneficent order, would manifest its Author, and call out faith and adoration. The unexpected departure of nature from its beaten path serves to impress on the minds of men the half-forgotten fact that, inseparable from the 'forces,' of nature, even in its ordinary movement, is the will of God. What are 'natural laws'? They are not causes. They are not a code superimposed upon natural objects. They are simply a generalized statement of the way in which the objects of nature are observed to act and interact. Thus the miracle does not clash with natural laws. It is simply a modification in the effect, due to the unusual exertion of the voluntary agency which is its cause." 2. Fisher's Theistic and Christian Belief, pp. 166-168.

We will now let a German thinker speak: "Why not look upon a miracle as that which it professes to be, as that apart from which it would be no miracle-as something happening outside the limits of the known laws of nature, be it an occurrence in obedience to higher laws, be it an arbitrary and supernatural intervention of God.

From this simple position with regard to a miracle, and this definition, which is contained in the Word itself, two things follow:

1. First, the absurdity of denying it. To maintain that no miracle has ever taken place, that such a thing is impossible, is nothing else than to maintain that we know all the forces and laws and possibilities in the universe.

As Maudsley remarks, "It is the presumption of human ignorance to hold that a thing is impossible, simply because it seems to us incomprehensible." Science is not, and never will be, in a position to decide with infallibility what can and what can not be. Therefore the possibility of a miracle, as something apparently incomprehensible, is not to be denied. The old discussion as to whether it results from the operation of laws unknown, or from a direct and sudden dispensation of God, is for us idle and unprofitable. We know of no laws of nature which, once set in motion by God, now work independently like a clock, constructed and wound up once for all. What we, for the sake of brevity and convenience, call natural forces, are really a continual exercise of the power of God, an emanation of His will. . . . There is for us nothing which can strictly be called natural, all is divine; and we might just as well say that every form of existence is a miracle, as that there is no such thing as a miracle.

2. The second result that follows from the above definition of a miracle, is the impossibility of scientifically disputing it. A miracle is altogether outside the province of scientific criticism. This was acknowledged by the great scientist, Tyndall, who was by no means a believer in the Bible, yet admitted that if there is a God, He is Almighty, and can therefore work miracles; and that miracles, if there is such a thing, have nothing to do with science, but lie outside her province.

Quite true we say, and would recommend this utterance of a man of the first rank, to those of the tenth rank who delight in confronting miracles with science.

He who tries to understand and to explain a miracle, to comprehend or to fix such a flash of illimitable, Divine power shows that he does not know what a miracle is, and in his attempt to explain it only succeeds in making a fool of himself, both from the scientific and Christian point of view. A miracle, scientifically proved and explained, would be a logical contradiction. No zoology, however advanced, will ever be able to prove that Balaam's ass was not miraculously endowed with speech; no physics, however deep and highly-developed, will be able to prove that the three Hebrews were burnt in the fiery furnace; or that Christ must have sunk when walking on the sea. Even a child must have recognized that these things were contrary to nature. He who allows his belief in miracles to be reasoned away or even shaken, by professedly scientific arguments, is, to say the least of it, sadly lacking in perspicacity, and would do well to test his conception of an Almighty God, and find out what he really does believe. God is a miracle, and he who does not believe in miracles does not believe in God, even though he believes that he believes in Him; that is to say, he is mentally too weak to grasp both. . . . We who believe in God, believe of necessity in a miracle, for a God who was obliged to obey self-made laws of nature with regard to the manner in which He reveals Himself in his creation, would not be, a God at all.

There are sundry facts which it is well to note in connection with the miracles recorded in the Bible. First, that they are done to the honor of God, and for the weal and blessing of mankind. The miracle has a moral purpose and an ethical value. Secondly, the miracle is not an arbitrary sport of God, but has an aim and a purpose. . . . Thirdly, the miracle is always an amplification and elevating of life. . . . Man was created for health and everlasting life; and the aim of science is to abolish disease, and some say death; Christ heals the sick and raises the dead in pledge of health and immortality...

Many people do not see the necessity for a miracle. It is true God does not need them; he does not perform miracles for his own sake; for Him there are no miracles; the creation of a new sun or the birth of a worm are the same to him. But for our sakes he performs miracles; for our sakes, that we may not be led to worship God as nature, nor nature as God! God works miracles in order to show Himself another and greater than his nature, and to say to everyone not spiritually blind: "I am in nature, but I am not nature. I am its Creator, and since I created it voluntarily, I can at any time arbitrarily alter it." . . .

Man cannot get away from miracles; even the materialist believes in them. Not in those, it is true, which happened eighteen hundred years ago, and to which many trustworthy men bore witness, more than one of whom sealed that witness with his life; but in such as happened millions of years ago, which were observed by none who could testify to their genuineness. That he may not have to believe in a creation, he believes in an unproved spontaneous generation, or imports at great expense life-germs from other worlds. That Christ raised the dead, made an organism that had lived, live again, he does not believe; but he does believe that organisms were generated by dead matter. That God for a special purpose endowed an ass with speech, that it spoke certain words, is too absurd to be believed; but that an ape, without knowing why, gradually began to talk, and that all the asses in the world will one day speak is, or ought to be, seriously believed by those who hold the doctrine of evolution!

That God, the Creator of fire and of men, should have made three men fire proof for a few minutes, seems to them a ridiculous legend; but they believe that organic germs existed for millions of years in the glowing cosmic gas and in molten granite. Nay, even a scientist like Tyndall, believes that all life-germs, the inventive faculty, reason and will, in all their manifestations were once 'latent in a fiery cloud!' If that is not a miracle, what is it?... Looking at things in their true light, we swim in miracles as a fish in the ocean, and what we call a 'miracle,' is only the, to us, unaccustomed falling of a few rain-drops into this infinite and fathomless sea." 1. Bettex: Science and Christianity, pp. 141-150.

We quote once more, and from Dr. Curtis of Drew Seminary: "Outside the range of conservative theology, there are three pronounced attitudes toward the miracles of the Bible.

1. The attitude where all miracles are regarded as impossible. The whole case is settled beyond recall by an a priori assumption.
2. The attitude is obnoxious to the person. . . . These are dominated by the scientific conception of natural law, and they feel that a miracle is incongruous, out of keeping with the quiet, steady majesty of the universal order, an event unlike God, an event which can be tolerated only by an immature mind, in short, miracle means to them lawlessness, and so it is an offense to their scientific habit of mind.
3. The attitude where the miracle is considered burdensome in Christian apology. At the front as teachers, or writers, or preachers, they feel the reality and sorrow of the fact that faith after faith is yielding, that man after man is going down into hopeless skepticism. They thus come to a full realization of the entire strain upon thoughtful men, in this, the most critical period in Christian history. And they try to relieve this strain; they try to see how much they can give up, and yet save the essential content of the Christian religion. As one writer stated it, in an editorial on "The Recession of Miracle," "We still hold to the miracle; but we are looking for our lines of retreat." Once filled with this apologetic purpose, it is not strange that the miracle is rejected outright or refined away.

The first of these attitudes does not merit the serious consideration of any real Christian theist; for if there is an infinite personal God, the question of miracle cannot be one of possibility, but must be one only of method or divine intention.

The second attitude results from a failure to appreciate the ethical dignity of a Christian miracle. It is not incongruous for God to-break the order, if such a rupture can be made to contribute to righteousness. There is majesty in the natural law; but there is still greater majesty in the moral law. As Cardinal Newman once said: "Miracles, though they contravene the physical laws of the universe, tend to the due fulfillment of its moral laws."

The third attitude is a serious misapprehension. The stress of the situation is not caused by science, but by a superficial ethical life. . . . Given a profoundly moral situation, and the Christian miracle would not be burdensome in the least. Science has not proven anything which tends in any way to weaken man's moral openness toward the literal resurrection of our Lord's body.

Again there is a misapprehension of the Christian religion itself. The miraculous cannot be taken out of Christianity, for the simple reason that it is fundamental in the Christian structure. Christianity is an organized miracle. Suppose you could get rid of the smaller miracles, you would still have to deal with the Incarnation and the Resurrection; and if you tried to get on without these, there would still be remaining the peculiar person of Jesus, and He is the most stupendous miracle of all, "the grand miracle of Christianity, about which all the others play as scintillations only of the central fire."

Now we sweep on to the Incarnation. To render possible the moral salvation of mankind, the only Son of God actually becomes man. This is beyond the divine habit, and against the divine habit; but it is more than all that, it is a continual contravention, a breaking forever of the normal life of the Godhead, an everlasting miracle. The whole ethical intensity of Christianity can be expressed in a sentence: The redemption of man has cost God a miraculous sacrifice which is never, never to end."1 1. Curtis, *The Christian Faith*, pp. 161-167.

We make no apology for these lengthy quotations from these noble scholars. The great battle with modern skepticism is being fought over miracles. Shallow theologians vainly imagine that they can relegate miracles, "to the rubbish heap of the world" and still have Christianity and salvation left. The acute minded and logical apostle Paul thought otherwise. He declared, "If Christ hath not been raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins."2 With Paul, it was miracles or no Christianity; faith in miracles, or damnation! 2. 1 Corinthians 15: 17.

Further, we wished to exhibit the childish prattle and fathomless conceit of those writers who affirm that "Modern thinkers reject the strictly miraculous everywhere." As if these skeptical scribblers against miracles were the only "modern thinkers"! As if there were not multitudes who are their peers in thinking, and literally thousands who are vastly their superiors in scholarship and literary reputation world-wide, and Christian usefulness that has reached the ends of the earth, all of whom believe in the Bible miracles! One wonders in what a Fool's Paradise these clerical infidels dwell!

II. Miracles admit of proof by testimony.

Here we are compelled to discuss briefly the famous argument of Hume, by which he thought to have annihilated belief in Christian miracles. Hume argued thus: "Experience is our only guide in reasoning concerning matters of fact... A miracle is a violation of the laws of nature; and as a firm and unalterable experience has established these laws, the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience can possibly be imagined."

"It is experience only which gives authority to human testimony; and it is the same experience which assures us of the laws of nature. When, therefore, these two kinds of experiences are contrary, we have nothing to do but subtract the one from the other... But this subtraction, with regard to all popular religions, amounts to an entire annihilation; and therefore we may establish it as a maxim, that no human testimony can have such force as to prove a miracle and make it a just foundation for such a system of religion."

We make the following answer to Hume's famous argument:

1. By his definition that a miracle is something against a firm and unalterable experience, he assumes the whole question in dispute.
2. He leaves God out of the problem. His so-called "laws of nature," are only the customary mode in which God operates. For a sufficient reason, He can temporarily change His mode of operation. What does God care about the customary method of running His physical machine, when the interests of His kingdom and the spiritual welfare of His children are at stake? One human being is of more significance to God than a world of dirt.
3. But Hume's third mistake is that he does not take moral government of God into his account at all. "It is like the mistake of the astronomer who should carefully notice the recurring movements of the planets around their primary, but should fail to notice that mightier movements by which the planets and suns are all borne onward toward some unknown point in infinite space."
4. Hume puts human experience at war with human testimony. There is no such conflict. When the Israelites testified to the miracle of crossing the Jordan, they testified to their own experience, which was a part of the experience of the race. The testimony and experience were one. Human experience could not overthrow the testimony to a miracle unless we could adduce the experience of every member of the race from the beginning of time.
5. Hume's argument is a practical absurdity. According to Hume the very thing that renders a miracle possible must render the proof of it impossible- Without an ordinary settled course of nature, there could be no extraordinary event which is a miracle; but with the uniformity, according to Hume, the extraordinary event could not be proved. It is absurd to suppose that the human mind can be put in such a relation as this to the proof of any possible event.
6. Hume begs the whole question. To say that a suspension of the laws of nature never happened because those laws are uniform, and to define a miracle as something that has never been observed in any age or country, is taking for granted the very thing to be proved. It is as bald and barefaced a "begging of the question" as can be imagined. Hume says, "It is a miracle that a dead man should come to life, because that has never happened in any age or country. There must therefore be a uniform experience against every miraculous event; otherwise the event would not merit that appellation." It is an utterly dishonest argument.
7. Hume violates the laws of logic by using the term "experience" in two senses. First he uses it in the sense of personal experience and contemporary experience; afterward he uses it in the sense of universal experience. By such juggling with this term in his premises he reaches his fallacious conclusion.
8. Professor Fisher points out that "The fundamental fallacy of this reasoning is in the premises, which base belief on naked 'experience,' divorced from all rational expectations drawn from any other source. The argument proceeds on the assumption that a miracle is just as likely to occur in one place as in another; that a miracle whereby the marks of truthfulness are transformed into a mask of error and falsehood is as likely to occur as the healing of a blind man, by a touch of the

hand. This might be so if the Power that governs the world were destitute of moral attributes. 'The question is whether the presumption against miracles as mere physical phenomena, is rebutted by the presumption in favor of miracles as works of infinite benevolence.' Hume's argument is valid only on the theory of Atheism."1 1. Fisher's Theistic Belief, pp. 169, 170.

9. Finally, Hume has given away his own argument. He manifestly felt its unsoundness, and added: "I beg the limitations here may be remarked when I say, that a miracle can never be proved so as to be the foundation of a system of religion. For I Own that otherwise, there may possibly be miracles, or violations of the usual course of nature, of such a kind as to admit of proof from human testimony." This single admission overthrows his whole argument.2 2. Mark Hopkins' "Evidences of Christianity," pp. 28-37.

He admitted that there might be a miracle if it had nothing to do with religion; but if it had, then it was flatly unprovable and impossible. He shut his eyes to all evidence in its favor, simply because he shut the eyes of his heart against religion and God.

Closing Remarks

Whatever probability there was that there would be a revelation, there was the same that there would be miracles. They were the means by which it would be possible for God to authenticate a communication to man. This is the simple, natural, majestic seal which we all should expect God would affix to a revelation from himself. As Professor Fisher says, "When inclined to believe in a revelation of God, we spontaneously crave some attestation of an objective character. We really expect, that, if all this be really on a plane above nature, there will be some explicit sign and confirmation of the fact. . .

The agency of God in connection with the origin of Christianity, is manifested to the senses, as,well as to the reason and heart...

Miracles, it may also be affirmed, are component parts of that gospel which is the object of belief. Not only are they parts of the act of revelation, they are also comprehended within the work of deliverance through Christ-the redemption which is the object of the Christian faith. This is evidently true of His resurrection, in which His victory over sin in its appropriate fruit, and His victory over death was realized as well as demonstrated to man."3 3. Fisher's Theistic Belief, pp. 176, 177

Miracles produced the following results:

1. A conviction of the being of a personal God, both im-manently in, and transcendently above, nature.
2. They showed that the laws of nature are subordinate to the higher laws of God's moral kingdom, and are controlled or temporarily suspended with reference to that. The moral government of God is His greatest concern, and the supreme interest of the universe. In comparison with that, the fixed order of the physical world is of no significance. "If a law of nature were destroyed it could be re-established; if a system of suns and planets were annihilated, another might be produced in its

room; if heaven and earth were to pass away, they might be created again; but if the brightness of the moral character of God (in administering His government) should be tarnished, that character would be lost forever."1 1. Hopkins' "Evidences of Christianity," pp. 60, 61.

It remains to speak a word about miracles that are false or pretended, or, if real to us and unaccountable, are used by the Evil One and his wicked emissaries for unholy ends. Mark Hopkins says: "I do not myself believe that any being but God can work a real miracle. Miracles are His great seal." This may possibly be true. But they may be counterfeited so successfully by Satan that they are as real to us as any miracle can be.

The Bible speaks about such miracles in seven very different passages, viz., Ex. 7: 11, 12; Deut. 13: 1-5; Mat. 24: 24; 2 Thess. 2: 9; Rev. 13: 13, 14; Rev. 16: 13, 14; Rev. 19: 20. Some of these are very remarkable, as Rev. 16: 13, 14: "And he doeth great signs, that he should even make fire to come down out of heaven upon the earth in the sight of men. And he deceiveth them that dwell upon the earth by reason of the signs . . . saying to them . . . that they should make an image to the beast."

Now, if a sign, or miracle, or wonder, should be wrought in our day, accompanied by a pretended message from God, by what criterion shall it be judged? There are three tests. (1) Are they worthy of God. The table-tippings and other fooleries of Spiritualism done in the dark, are not worthy of Him. (2) Are they wrought by men of pure and benevolent lives? (3) Are the teachings accompanying the miracles in harmony with the Word of God, and His character, and of the highest importance to man, and in entire conformity to his nature.

An apparent miracle, performed by an unclean person, asking us to forsake God, or to sin, we should never heed.

But the Bible miracles offer no such practical difficulty. They were performed by saintly men, accompanied by a call to practical Godliness, and were becoming the high and holy God.

Let us hear no more of this senseless clamor against, and drivelling criticism of the Bible miracles. They reflect no credit on either the intellects or the hearts of the critics.

We say with our old and revered teacher of Church History, Professor Fisher, "In fine, miracles are the complement of the internal evidence. The two sorts of proof lend support, each to the other, and they conspire together to satisfy the candid inquirer that Christianity is of supernatural origin."1 1 Fisher's Theistic and Christian Belief, p. 177.

* * * * *

CHAPTER IV -- GENUINENESS AND AUTHENTICITY OF SCRIPTURES

The genuineness of a book consists in its having been written by the author whose name it bears. The word has relation only to authorship. Is it the production of its reputed author, or is it forged and spurious? We have in our possession a Bible consisting of sixty-six different productions purporting to have been written by certain authors. These different productions have been

collected by the early Fathers of the Church and bound together in one volume, called The Bible. Is it a genuine book?

I. Consider the Old Testament.

1. It existed in the days of Christ, as we have it now. Josephus so describes it as to make the number of the books agree with our Old Testament.

2. The books of The Old Testament were translated into the Greek language for the use of the Alexandrian Jews, two hundred and eighty-seven years before Christ. So the book then existed.

3. The claim is put forward that Moses did not write the Pentateuch and that it and most of the other books were written hundreds of years after they were claimed to have been written, and not by their accredited authors. But the Jews existed very anciently as a nation. And it has been an uninterrupted tradition among them that Moses led them out of Egypt and first gave them their system of laws and religion. The history of that event and the giving of their laws is recorded in the Bible as by Moses.

Now this "book of the Law of Moses, which the Lord had commanded to Israel," was openly read to the people in the time of Nehemiah (Neh. 8: 1). In Ezra's time they "built an altar to offer burnt offerings as it is written in the law of Moses the man of God" (Ez. 3: 2, 6: 18). So Ezra did not write the books. The Pentateuch was known in his time.

4. But the Pentateuch was acknowledged as the book of Law, and they worshiped according to its directions, when they served God at all, both in the ten tribes and the two tribes. It follows that the book was known before the kingdom was divided, about 970 B. C.

5. The great temple of Solomon was built and sacrifices were offered in harmony with Moses' teaching in his books. David continually referred to it in his Psalms.

6. Samuel, in his teaching referred to the main points of the nation's history and mentioned Moses and Aaron in connection with bringing the fathers out of the land of Egypt. See 1 Sam. 12. So he did not write the books and palm them off on the people as ancient history. The people in Samuel's time had the ark made by Moses' direction, and the table of the law and the other furnishings, all witness to the Story of the Pentateuch and Moses its author.

7. Joshua, the companion of Moses, mentioned in the 24th of Joshua the same facts recorded by the books of Moses. It was in a public address to the people as matters of fact with which all were acquainted.

All this history is uncontradicted by the historic records of other nations. The genuineness of the books can not be shaken except on principles of Skepticism that would equally shake the foundation of all history.

II. Consider the New Testament.

1. Quotations from the books of the New Testament are found in the writings of the Church Fathers.

(1) Clement. The Epistle ascribed to Clement is an epistle from "The Church of God Sojourning at Rome to the Church of God Sojourning at Corinth." Irenaeus says it was written by Clement, "Who had seen the blessed Apostles, and conversed with them, who had the preaching of the apostles still sounding in his ears, and their traditions before his eyes." Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, about 170 A. D. bears witness that Clement's Epistle had been read in that church from ancient times. It has quotations from, or evident allusions to eight books of the New Testament, and expressly names Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. Clement says: "Remember the words of the Lord Jesus, 'Woe to that man by whom offenses come; it were better for him that a millstone should be tied about his neck, and that he should be drowned in the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones.'"

(2) Ignatius, bishop at Antioch, suffered martyrdom about the year 107, quotes from two Gospels and four Epistles and expressly names the epistle to the Ephesians.

(3) Polycarp, a companion of Ignatius, was a bishop at Smyrna. Irenaeus, who in his youth had seen him, says, "I can tell the place in which the blessed Polycarp sat and taught, and his going out and coming in, and the manner of his life, and the form of his person, and the discourses he made to the people, and how he related his conversation with John, and others who had seen the Lord, both concerning his miracles and his doctrines, as he had received them from the eyewitnesses of the Word of life; all of which Polycarp related agreeably to the Scriptures," In one short epistle that has survived, there are clear allusions to fourteen books of the New Testament, and he names the epistle to the Philippians.

(4) Papias was a companion of Polycarp. Eusebius quotes from a work of his in which he ascribes their respective Gospels to Matthew and Mark.

All the above were contemporaries with some of the Apostles, and quote from, or allude to, most of the books of the New Testament, and uniformly treat them with the reverence due to inspired books.

(5) Justin Martyr, born 105, died 160. He was for half a century a contemporary of Polycarp, a convert from heathenism after he had arrived at mature age, and was distinguished as a philosopher, a Christian, and a writer. We have of his writings two Apologies, one to the Emperor Titus Antoninus, and one to Marcus Antoninus, and His Dialogue with Tripho the Jew. In these he made thirty-five quotations from Matthew alone. He either quotes or clearly refers to the Acts of the Apostles and nearly all the Epistles, and says expressly that the Revelation was written by John. He calls the Gospels and The Acts, "Memoirs composed by the Apostles and their companions." There is almost a complete history of Christ, and yet he mentions only two circumstances not found in the Gospels.

(6) Tatian comes next. About 170 he composed a Harmony of The Gospels, which he called "Diatessaron," showing that there were then four, and only four, Gospels.

(7) Irenaeus. Born about 130 A. D. Was bishop of Lyons, 177 A. D. He was a disciple of Polycarp. Of his writings only five books against heresies remain. He was only one step removed from the Apostles, and wrote within one hundred years of the publication of the early Gospels. He mentions the code of the New Testament as well as the Old, and calls both The Oracles of God. His testimony is full and explicit to all the books of the New Testament, except of Jude. He appeals to the books as the ground of the Christian faith in these words: "We have not received the knowledge of the way of salvation by any other than those by whom the gospel has been brought to us; which gospel they first preached, and afterward, by the will of God, committed to writing, that it might be for time to come the foundation and pillar of our faith..."

For, after our Lord rose from the dead, and they were endued from above with the power of the Holy Ghost, coming down upon them, they received a perfect knowledge of all things. They then went forth to all the ends of the earth, declaring to men the blessings of heavenly peace, having all of them, and everyone alike, the Gospel of God.

Matthew, then, among the Jews, wrote a Gospel in their own language, while Peter and Paul were preaching in Rome and founding a Church there. And after their exit, Mark, also the disciple and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in writing the things that had been preached by Peter; and Luke, the companion of Paul, put down in a book the gospel preached by him. Afterward, John, the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned upon His breast, he likewise published a gospel, while he dwelt at Ephesus, in Asia."

Could testimony be more explicit or more satisfactory? And he wrote this no farther off in time from the last years of the apostle John and the composition of his Gospel than we are removed from the brilliant days of Daniel Webster in the United States' Senate, and the early years of Queen Victoria's reign! The truth is during the first century, nineteen books of the New Testament are referred to incidentally; in the second century thirty-six writers refer to these books; and in the third and fourth centuries over a hundred writers. Nearly the entire New Testament could be reproduced from their quotations. 1. Hopkins' "Evidences of Christianity," pp. 247-262.

Those early fathers manifestly did not doubt the genuineness of the books of the New Testament.

2. Catalogues of the New Testament books were made early by different authors, from which we learn that the books which are now received, were in existence then, and were believed to be genuine. The first catalogue is that of Origen, made 210 A. D. He omitted only James and Jude, but acknowledged both epistles in his other writings. That was as near to the death of the Apostle John as we are to the death of George Washington. He evidently had ample opportunity to know what he was writing about.

3. The Syriac version was probably made early in the second century, and the first Latin versions almost as early. The New Testament must have existed and been received before these translations were made.

III. The Integrity of the Scriptures.

By the Integrity of the Scriptures is meant their uncorrupted preservation.

1. The Integrity of the Canon. The Canon means in theology, the authorized collection of the Sacred Writings. The Old Testament Collection doubtless began to be made by the leading men and priests under the supervision or leadership of Ezra and Nehemiah, to which Zechariah and Malachi and some other later books were added, as they were written.

But the Septuagint Translation of all was made B. C. 287, and has come down to us from that time.

2. The Canon or collection of the New Testament was made by degrees. First the Four Gospels were brought together in the early part of the second century, and in the third century were accepted throughout the Christian world. They were prefixed to the other books of the New Testament, because the history of Jesus was considered the basis of all Christian doctrine; just as the historical writings of Moses were prefixed to the Old Testament as the basis of the Jewish faith. The epistles were collected somewhat later than the gospels, and all were brought together by the beginning of the third Christian Century, or within one hundred years of the Apostle John.

3. The integrity of the separate books will appear from the fact that there were many checks and hindrances to their corruption. The profound regard which the Jews had for their sacred books, and the large numbers of copies of them widely circulated over the world rendered their corruption impossible.

The Law of Moses was the deed by which the land of Canaan was divided among the tribes and families of Israel. Every one was directly interested in keeping the records unaltered. Then the upper and lower Kingdoms were both jealously watching each other, and later the Samaritans and the Jews, were guarding the same sacred books, and protecting them from alteration. So the Jews and the Christians have been a check upon each other.

During the Christian Centuries the Eastern Church-with its center at Constantinople-and the Western Church, circling around Rome jealously guarded the Bible from any intended corruption by either party.

Moreover, the Christians were persecuted and scattered over the earth, and they took copies of their sacred books with them. These were copied by hand, and recopied, again and again, times without number. By no possibility could any one have gathered up all these copies of the scriptures and altered any single verse in all of them.

4. Variations in Readings.

Let it be remembered that printing is a modern invention only about four hundred years old. Had the Bibles of the early church been printed with infallible accuracy, all exactly alike, we should not have had so many various readings. But the ancient books were all written in solid lines of letters with no divisions of words or sentences, and the ancient Hebrew did not even have any vowels. When a new book was wanted; it had to be laboriously copied by hand. The manuscripts were, transcribed with great caution and exactness. The alteration of a letter if noticed would often condemn the copy to the flames. It is said that the Jews recorded the number of letters in each

manuscript, and marked the middle letter as a safeguard against corruption. Without a doubt the copies of scripture were made with most watchful, religious care.

But, nevertheless, the transcribers would make mistakes. Letters would sometimes be omitted, or their places would get changed; or one letter would get substituted inadvertently for another, in cases where they were very nearly alike; or some little mark would be omitted, that changed the meaning. When such a mistake was once made, it might be repeated by a score or a hundred transcribers. Thus by the negligence or inaccuracy of the copyists, through the many centuries, in hundreds of manuscripts, there came to be ten thousand various readings in the Old Testament, and one hundred and fifty thousand in the New Testament, as the eminent scholars tell us, who have spent their lives in the critical examination of these ancient writings.

But even this did not destroy the essential accuracy of our Bible. The various copies would correct one another, so that the scholars were nearly always able to determine the true reading. They assure us that not one doctrine of the church has been in the least shaken by these various readings. "In all essential points they perfectly agree, and in no degree whatever, affect the general credit or integrity of the sacred text." Says the noble commentator, Bengel, to his pupil: "Eat the scripture bread in simplicity, just as you have it, and do not be disturbed if here and there you find a grain of sand, which the mill-stone may have suffered to pass. If the Holy Scriptures which have been so often copied, were absolutely without variations, this would be so great a miracle that faith in them would be no longer faith. I am astonished, on the contrary, that from all these transcriptions there has not resulted a greater number of various readings." Another scholar says: "The integrity of the Holy Scriptures is substantiated by evidence tenfold more various, copious, and conclusive than that which can be adduced in support of any other ancient book, even the most highly prized Greek and Latin classics. If, therefore, the facts relating to the origin, nature, and progress of Christianity are not established, nothing in human history can be believed."

IV. The Authenticity of Scriptures.

An authentic book is one that truthfully relates matters of fact as they really happened. We have shown the genuineness and integrity of the books of the Bible. We now need to inquire whether they are authentic, and deal with facts, or whether they are collections of fictions and myths and folk-lore tales, or forgeries and inventions of imaginative and ambitious writers of some other age.

We contend that the Bible, barring a few inconsiderable and manifest interpolations and errors of copyists, is a most truthful book. The events recorded, and the truth and doctrines are so interdependent and interwoven, that they stand or fall together.

The authenticity of the Scriptures may be discussed under the following heads:

1. The matters of history in the Bible.

The historic parts of the Bible must be judged by the rules of historical evidence like any other book, such, for example, as the histories of men and national life recorded by Moses. Was he the leader and law-giver of the Jewish people? Did he lead them out of Egypt, and bring them into part of their inheritance? Is the subsequent history of the nation under Joshua and the Judges and the

Kings true? Are the histories of the Patriarchs truthful accounts of real men or are they legends of imaginary heroes. Was David the progenitor of a dynasty of kings? Was Jesus, on the human side, one of his descendants? Are the events recorded in the life of Christ, from His birth to His ascension, true?

We will only suggest here that these histories in our Bible have come down to us from the most ancient times, some of them being certainly much more than three thousand years old. These records have always been accepted by the Jews as their national history, and this people must be accounted for; for in many respects they have been for millenniums the most remarkable people our race has ever produced. The account of them, given by Moses was written when hundreds of thousands of eye-witnesses of the events and participants in them, were still living. It would have been impossible for a fictitious narrative of public events to be accepted as true by the generation who participated in them. And a false and unheard-of history could not have been palmed off upon the nation at any later date.

The authenticity of the Scripture history in general is proved by manifold evidence, some internal, and some external and corroborative.

Here we may appropriately mention an argument for the credibility of the facts contained in our sacred books "which never has been and never can be answered. Infidels have been repeatedly challenged to answer it, but they have never made the attempt." 1 It is the argument of Leslie in his "Short Method with the Deists." 1. Hopkins' "Evidences of Christianity," p. 279.

This argument rests upon the peculiarity of our religion, the truth of which is indissolubly connected with certain history and matters of fact, which could originally be judged of by the senses, and also upon the fact that there exist today in the world ordinances and institutions commemorative of the facts. The object of Leslie is to show, from the nature of the case, that the matters of fact could not have been received at the time unless they were true, and that the observances could never have originated except in connection with the facts. In showing this he lays down four rules, and asserts that any matter of fact in which these four rules meet, must be true, and challenges the world to show any instance of any supposed matter of fact, thus authenticated, that has ever been shown to be false.

Leslie's Four Rules.

1. "That the matter of fact be such that men's outward senses, their eyes and ears, may be judges of it."
2. "That it be done publicly, in the face of the world."
3. "That not only public monuments be kept up in memory of it, but some outward actions be performed."
4. "That such monuments, and such actions, or observances, be instituted, and do commence from the time that the matter of fact was done."

"The first two rules make it impossible for any such matter of fact to be imposed upon men at the time, because every man's eyes and ears and senses would contradict it." For instance, could the population of any city in the world be made to believe, that they walked yesterday across a swollen river on dry ground with the water piled up before their eyes threatening to engulf them, if the thing did not happen?

No more could the children of Israel of the time of Moses, have believed that the Death Angel passed over Egypt and touched not the homes shielded by the blood, or that they marched out of Egypt and through the Red Sea, or went out and gathered manna every morning, or drank water from the rock, or that the law was given amidst the thunderings of Sinai, as described in the Bible, if these things did not happen.

Not less impossible was it that the five thousand should have believed that they were fed by Christ; or that the relatives and friends of Lazarus should have believed that he was raised from the dead, or the five hundred who saw Christ after his crucifixion, and heard him speak and saw him ascend up into heaven, should have believed in his resurrection and ascension if the events did not take place. The great historic facts of our religion are of such a nature that, if they never took place, it is impossible that they should have been believed at the time.

"Therefore it only remains that such matter of fact might have been invented some time after, when the men of that generation wherein the thing was said to be done are all past and gone, and the credulity of after ages might be imposed upon to believe that things were done in former ages which were not actually done.

"Now the last two rules guard against just such a deception. For, whenever such a matter of fact came to be invented, if not only monuments were said to remain of it, but likewise that public actions and observances were constantly used ever since the matter of fact was said to be done, the deceit must be detected by no such monuments appearing, and by the experience of every man, woman and child, who must know that no such actions or observances were ever used by them."

Now with these tests in mind, could the books of Moses or the New Testament, have been invented and imposed upon the world at a later age? Moses tells about the plagues in Egypt and the passing over of the death angel, and the institution of the Passover in commemoration of it, and the crossing of the Red Sea and the giving of the law at Sinai, and the two tables on which they were engraved, and the Ark and Tabernacle, and the Manna that fell from heaven, and fiery serpents and the serpent of brass. A Pot of Manna, and The Two Tables of The Law, and the Brazen Serpent were preserved as memorials. They had the account of the Laws, and Priesthood and Tabernacle service. Now could Samuel have invented these stories hundreds of years after these supposed events occurred, and made the people of Israel believe it was their national history, and that they had always observed the annual Passover, and had always had the Ark, and The Tables of the Law, and The Pot of Manna, and the Brazen Serpent, when nobody, up to that time, had ever heard of them? Could a whole nation of men be thus imposed upon, and made to believe that they had always had certain civil and religious institutions and ordinances, and annual feasts, and laws and memorials, when they knew to a man, that it was all an invention?

Such a question answers itself. But the same is true of the New Testament. We have the four Gospels, giving the account of the Life, Death, and Resurrection of Jesus, and The Formation of the Christian Church. We have memorials and monumental witnesses to the truths of the history.

The Gospels tell us that Jesus gave us the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper, to be observed to the end of time; that a ministry was appointed and a Church established. We still have the sacraments and the ministry, and the Church that is taking possession of the world. We have two monuments to the resurrection of Jesus: the Annual Easter Memorial, and the weekly change of the sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week.

These memorials can be traced in line clear back to the time of Christ, and to his death and resurrection from the dead, and no further.

This matchless history never could have been invented and foisted upon any later age. We have, therefore, visible signs and pledges of the truth of our religion and the Authenticity of Bible handed down, independently of written testimony, from age to age; and the force of which, age has no tendency to diminish.

2. We may inquire as to the authenticity of the Scriptures when they narrate public occurrences of a supernatural order; e. g., the miracles. Here, indeed, Leslie's rules apply with special force. If these books or accounts were written and published while multitudes were alive who must have witnessed the facts, had they really transpired, it is manifestly impossible that any narrative of these events could have been received which was not strictly true.

3. Are the Scriptures authentic in their account of the acts and teachings and sayings of the Bible characters, Moses and the prophets, Christ and the apostles? Here we have abundance of ground for confidence in the truthfulness of our Scriptures. In spite of all the minor difficulties, insignificant in character and few in number, that the acutest critic can point out, the record as a whole commands and deserves unbounded faith. And this for many reasons. Confining our remarks to the New Testament we observe:

(1) The witnesses and writers were in a position to judge accurately of the things which they relate. They were the select companions and familiar friends of Jesus. They had free access to him at all times; they heard both his public and private discourses; were with him night and day, as inseparable attendants and servants from the beginning to the close of his public ministry. No authors ever had a greater opportunity to know all the facts about their hero than the disciples had to know Jesus.

(2) Their character was such as to preclude any rational suspicion of fraud or untruthfulness. They lived holy, unselfish lives, as became professed disciples of the holy Son of God. Their purity and virtue and self-denial forbid the supposition that they spent their lives industriously witnessing to falsehoods in the name of God. As a great educator has stated it, "It is not in human nature, there is no example of it, for even one man to persevere through a long life, in undergoing labors and sufferings, and finally die, in attestation of what he knew to be false; much less can we suppose that twelve men did it, yea, that hundreds and thousands, could do this. The character of Christ and his apostles in other respects, and the nature of the religion which he taught, forbid the supposition

that they were deceivers. To suppose that men, teaching a morality more perfect than any other ever known, and exemplifying it in their conduct, living lives of great simplicity, and self-denial, and benevolence, enforcing truth and honesty, by the most tremendous sanctions of a future life, should, without any possible advantage to themselves, die as martyrs in attestation of what they knew to be false, is practically absurd."1 Deceivers would not teach holiness, much less live it. 1. Hopkins' "Evidences of Christianity," pp. 276, 277.

(3) Granting, now, that they were not intentional deceivers, neither could they have been deceived. They could not have been deceived about Jesus feeding the five thousand, for they passed the bread around and helped eat it; they witnessed a hundred miracles under every conceivable circumstance; they saw Christ crucified, and buried; they saw Him for forty days after His resurrection; received His rebuke, and reproof, and commission, and promise of blessing, and then saw Him ascend into heaven. They could not be mistaken about these things, and about their receiving the Pentecostal blessing, and power to bless other lives. They wrote and testified to these events, and sealed their testimony with their lives.

(4) These writers and disciples and early Christians had no conceivable motives for deceiving the world. Men may have motives for being impostors, but they can have none for being imposed upon, especially when the imposition costs them all that the natural heart prizes and men usually hold dear.

The earthly rewards which the apostles of our Lord did obtain for their devotedness to His cause are graphically described by St. Paul as follows: "Even unto this present hour we both hunger and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling place; we are made as the filth of the world, and are the off-scouring of all things unto this day" (1 Cor. 4: 11-13). Their Master had faithfully warned them of persecution and martyrdom, in the daily expectation of which they lived. To submit to the endurance of such evils, from which human nature revolts, and to which no sane man, that could help it, would expose himself without compensation, in the interest of fraud and deceit, is against reason, and contrary to the conduct of mankind. At the same time, in the very doctrines they promulgate, if their testimony is false, they doom themselves, as conscious liars and hypocrites, to the damnation of hell. Manifestly, they never did it. It is unthinkable.

(5) The Gospel writers gave us books that bear every stamp of credibility. They are written in the most perfect simplicity and candor. The general air of truth and sincerity in the narratives is unmistakable. The utter artlessness of the style is above all art, even of the most consummate skill. We look in these writings in vain for any signs of superstitious weakness or enthusiastic fervors. There is nothing in their character, aside from their narration of miracles and their maintaining their testimony at all hazards, that bears any mark of fanaticism. On the contrary, they are everywhere marked by good sense and sobriety. There are no extravagant expressions, no indication of excessive emotion, no high wrought description, no praise, and no censure. There is a simple Statement of the facts of the life of Christ, and a record of his discourses. They do not make the slightest effort to adorn their history. They record the most momentous and astonishing events that ever transpired on our planet, in as common place a manner and with as much dispassionate coolness, as if they had been the commonest transactions of every-day life.

(6) This is not all. The sacred writers are conspicuous above all others for their flawless integrity. Impostors never proclaim to the world the defects of their own characters. But these men detailed their own errors and faults without the slightest attempt at concealment or extenuation. They inform us of their lowliness and poverty, their dulness of apprehension, and of their unholy ambitions, and warm contentions among themselves. They even tell us how basely they deserted their Master, when he was seized by His Enemies; and that, after his crucifixion, they returned to secular life, abandoning the cause to which they had been devoted. Although Peter was the early leader of the Apostolic band, his base denial of Jesus was published as fully as the betrayal of Judas, or the injustice of Pilate. So absorbed are these authors in bringing out the truth of their story, that all personal considerations sank out of sight. However it may reflect on their characters or blight their reputation, they give a truthful history without a thought of its effect upon themselves. "What surer mark of an honest narrator can exist," says Professor Fisher, "than a willingness to give a plain, unvarnished account of his own mortifying mistakes, and the consequent rebuffs, whether just or not, which he has experienced? . . . Men are not likely to invent anecdotes to their own discredit."¹

1. Fisher's Theistic Belief, pp. 313, 314.

(7) Their testimony was in the highest degree circumstantial. They were most minute in their narratives, giving dates, names of persons, places, references to persons then living, many of whom were people of consequence. Had there been any intent to deceive, or any fabrication of the story, all such things would certainly have been omitted, since everyone of them supplied facilities for detection. If what they wrote had not been true, they would have been contradicted; and if contradicted on good evidence, the authors would have been overwhelmed with confusion.

(8) This argument is enforced by the consideration that "these things were not done in a corner." The age was not dark and illiterate and prone to accept myths and fables. The Jewish, the Grecian, and the Roman civilizations, with all their wealth of literature and culture, by a most extraordinary combination of circumstances, were brought together, to unite their combined rays upon the cradle of Christianity. There had never been anything like it before, nor has there been since. As one has said, "No other people of antiquity can be named, upon whose history and sentiments there falls this triple flood of historic light; and upon no period in the history of this one people do these triple rays so precisely meet as upon the moment when the voice of one was heard in the wilderness of Jordan, saying, 'Prepare ye the way of the Lord.' . . . "It was perhaps the only place on earth where a Roman governor would have called the three languages which contain the literature of ancient civilization into requisition, to proclaim at once the accusation and the true character of Christ. 'And Pilate wrote a title, and put it on the cross. And the writing was -Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews- And it was written in Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin!'"

It was a mixed community of strong prejudices, and bitter rivalries between conflicting religions and civilization, cultured and critical to the last degree. Of all times that was the least opportune, and of all places that was precisely the one most unfavorable for launching religious forgeries, to make a new religion, that would supplant all others, and possess the earth. The New Testament had to be genuine and truthful to the last degree, and Christ had to be the very Person the Book presents to us, or Christianity was doomed to failure from its very birth.

(9) The truthfulness of the Scriptures is further shown by the willingness of the authors to picture the human weakness of Christ. As Professor Fisher says, "The manifestations of human infirmity in

Jesus, infirmity which does not involve sin, are referred to in the plainest manner, and without the least apology or concealment. These passages occur side by side with the accounts of miracles. Had there been a conscious or latent disposition to glorify their Master at the expense of truth, it is scarcely possible that they would have spread out these illustrations of human weakness. It is only necessary to remind the reader of the record of the agony of Jesus in the garden. We are informed that He was overwhelmed with mental distress. He sought the close companionship of the three disciples who were most intimate with Him. He prostrated Himself on the earth in supplication to God. As He lay on the ground, one of the evangelists tells us-if we adopt the accepted reading-that the sweat fell from His body, either actually mingled with blood, or in drops like drops of blood. . . . 'My soul,' thus He had spoken to the three disciples, 'is exceeding sorrowful unto death.' In the presence of passages like these, how can it be thought that the Apostles were enthusiasts, oblivious or careless of facts, and bent on presenting an ideal of their own devising, rather than the life of Jesus just as they had seen it." 1. Fisher's Theistic Belief, pp. 315, 316.

(10) There is not a mark of spuriousness in these sacred Scriptures. The reasons which render the authenticity of a book suspicious are thus laid down by Michaelis: 1. When doubts have been entertained, from its first appearance, whether it was the work of its reputed author. 2. When the immediate friends of the author have denied it to be his. 3. When a long series of years has elapsed, after his death, in which the book was unknown, and in which it must have been mentioned and quoted, had it been in existence. 4. When the style is different from his other writings, or, in case no others remain, from what might be reasonably expected. 5. When events are recorded which happened later than the time of the pretended author. 6. When opinions are advanced contradictory to those which He is known to have advanced in other writings. "Of these marks of spuriousness, not one can be attached to a single book of the New Testament." 1. Hopkins' "Evidences of Christianity," p. 26S.

If these writings are not authentic and true they must have been forgeries; and they are of such a character, and purport to have been written under such circumstances, as to render a forgery impossible. Here, for example, are no fewer than nine letters which claim to have been written to numerous bodies of men, and received by them; and can any man believe that such letters, often containing severe reproof, could have been received and read, as we know these were, by the early Christians, if they were forgeries?

And if the New Testament is an untruthful book, and a forgery, bear in mind, it is not an instance of a single successful forgery, but of twenty-seven separate ones, imposed upon intelligent men, in an age of wide-spread culture, inclined to be both critical and skeptical, all whose interests were involved in detecting the fraud. In fact the theory that our Bible is an unreliable book, and that the Christian Church, the greatest institution in the world, and Christianity, that produced the greatest moral revolution of the ages, were both the product of untruthful writings is a theory, so beset with difficulties, so wild and so unreasonable, that it should not be entertained for a moment, by an honest mind.

To sum up the facts: 1. We have a New Testament, containing five histories, four of them separate lives of Christ, written by four different persons, who were themselves eyewitnesses, or learned from others who were, the things which they relate. 2. We also have in it original letters, written at the time, both to churches and to individuals, containing a great variety of indirect, and therefore of

the very strongest, testimony. 3. We find the books bearing every mark of honesty. 4. We find the facts of such a nature that the witnesses could not have been deceived, and we find them laying down their lives to testify that they did not deceive others. 5. We find institutions now existing, and rites observed which hold such a relation to the facts of Christianity, as given in the books, that the books must be true. 6. We find, moreover, no other account, nor the vestige of any of this greatest revolution the world has ever known, while our accounts are perfectly simple, and natural, and satisfactory. Christianity is here, and it started in the first century. It is to be accounted for. Our Bible tells us how it came into being. If the New Testament is not a true history, then no one can tell us how it originated. In short, the truth of our Bible is supported by overwhelming evidence. It has commanded the reverent faith of the centuries. To cast discredit upon it, at this late date, and then lend a listening ear to the conjectures and guesses of infidel critics is stupendous folly.

* * * * *

CHAPTER V -- REVELATION AND INSPIRATION

By Revelation is meant a direct communication from God to man, either of such knowledge as man needed to know and could not of himself attain to, or which, in point of fact, was not known to the person who received the revelation. The subject matter of the revelation might transcend human sagacity or human reason. Such were the facts about the creation of the world revealed to Moses; the tripersonality of the Godhead, called the doctrine of the Trinity; God's atonement through the death of His Son; His method of forgiving sin. Human reason never would have discovered these truths, and man needed to know them. They were graciously revealed to man by a loving Father.

By inspiration is meant that actuating energy of the Holy Spirit, under the guidance of which, the men chosen by God, have accurately and authoritatively proclaimed His will by word of mouth, or have committed to writing the several portions of the Bible.

Definitions: 1. "Divine inspiration is that supernatural divine influence on the prophets, apostles, or sacred writers, by which they were qualified to communicate truth without error; a supernatural influence which qualifies men to receive and communicate divine truth."-Webster.

2. "Inspiration literally signifies a breathing into; it denotes that extraordinary agency of the Holy Spirit on the mind, in consequence of which the person who partakes of it, is enabled to embrace and communicate the truth of God without error, infirmity, or defect."-Dr. Hannah.

3. "Divine Inspiration is the imparting of such a degree of Divine assistance, influence or guidance, as should enable the authors of the Scriptures to communicate religious knowledge to others without error or mistake, whether the subjects of such communications were things then immediately revealed to those who declare them, or things with which they were before acquainted." -Home.

4. "Divine Inspiration may be defined to be that extraordinary influence of the Holy Spirit upon the human mind by which men were qualified to communicate to others religious knowledge without error or mistake."-Wakefield.

5, "On this subject the common doctrine of the Church is and ever has been, that inspiration was an influence of the Holy Spirit on the minds of certain select men, which rendered them the organs of God, for the infallible communication of His mind and will. They were in such a sense the organs of God, that what they said, God said." -Dr. Charles Hodge.

It will be noticed that there is substantial agreement between these definitions. A dozen more might be quoted from eminent theologians, of a similar trend; They fairly state the faith of the orthodox Church through the centuries. Let it be observed and distinctly understood, that these definitions refer to the original documents of Scripture as they came from the hands of their authors-Moses, David, Isaiah, Matthew, John, Peter or Paul. The Bible, as we now have it, is marred somewhat by the infirmities of human copyists. Here and there a few interpolations have crept in, and different readings in different manuscripts, which, as every honest scholar will admit, mars the absolute verbal perfection of our Bible. Probably no translation ever made was absolutely perfect. These minor errors could not have been avoided unless God had worked a perpetual miracle upon the minds and fingers of every copyist and translator and type-setter that ever worked upon our precious Book.

But such reverent care and prayerful thought have been bestowed upon it through all the centuries that we still have substantially the divinely inspired Book, as God gave it.

We may now define what is not meant by saying that the Bible is divinely inspired.

1. We do not mean merely that it is a work of human genius. Some flippant writers say, "O yes, the Bible is inspired like the Iliad of Homer, or Shakespeare's Hamlet, or Milton's Paradise Lost." We mean, and the Bible, when it speaks of inspiration, means vastly more. The Bible is inspired as no other book ever written. The works of human genius however excellent are the natural products of the human mind; the Inspiration of the Bible is Supernatural. It is a "Thus saith the Lord."

2. It is not merely a divine illumination. Every regenerated Christian is more or less taught, and led, and indwelt, by the Holy Spirit. But they are not inspired in the sense that the writers of the Old and New Testament were. The inspiration of the ordinary Christian, which we by no means under-rate, may coexist with many errors, and crude notions; but the Divine Inspiration of the authors of the Word enabled them to give us the mind of God without crudity or error. Eminent Christians now often have given them an inspired insight into the Scriptures; but the authors of the Bible were inspired to write them.

3. Inspiration did not imply or involve any suppression or setting aside of the natural power and faculties of the writers. It did not destroy their individuality, nor restrain the free play of their thoughts and feelings. The natural poet, when inspired, still wrote as a poet. The logician, when inspired, did not forget his logic. The clear thinker, when inspired, lost none of his lucidity. God used the men as intelligent, voluntary agents, and his inspiration neither made them unconscious nor irrational. Each author preserved his peculiar style and mode of expression, yet God used the author to record his own thought. Hence the marvelous variety of the sacred writings, and their perfect adaptation to interest all classes of minds and meet the needs of every condition of men. The human and the Divine are so inextricably blended that it is impossible to separate them or discriminate between them.

4. Divine Inspiration does not imply an equal clearness and fulness in the exhibition of Divine truth, in every part of the sacred Book. Jesus plainly affirmed that revelation was progressive, and that not all truth could be given in fulness in the Old Testament times. Even in his own day, Jesus said: "I have many things to say unto you; but ye cannot bear them now"; but he assured them that the Spirit would guide them into all truth.

The religion of the Old Testament and The New Testament are different, yet are parts of the same. Beyond all question the Bible comes to flower and fruitage in the New Testament. But neither part is complete without the other.

The New Testament authors and Jesus himself always treated the Old Testament with profoundest respect, as inspired, even though some things were tolerated in it "because of the hardness of men's hearts." The original writers of the Old Testament were inspired to write, just as the writers of the New Testament were; but any spiritual mind will feel that the New Testament, as a whole, is on a higher, moral plane, and reveals more of the spirituality of a Holy God than does the Old Testament.

Yet Jesus and His Apostles refer to nearly all parts of the volume as the Word of God. They make no distinction as to the authority of the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets. They quote from the Pentateuch, the historical books, the Psalms and the Prophets. They treat all they quote from as the Word of God. They also refer to all classes of facts as infallibly true.

Not only great doctrinal facts, such as the creation and probation of man; his apostasy; the call of Abraham; the giving of the Law upon Mount Sinai; not only great historical facts, as the deluge, the deliverance of the people out of Egypt, the passage of the Red Sea and of the Jordan, and the like; but incidental circumstances, and things of minor importance, such as Moses' lifting up the brazen serpent in the wilderness, and the healing of Naaman's leprosy, and the visit of the queen of Sheba to Solomon, and even Jonah's experience with the whale, are all mentioned with a childlike faith in their absolute truthfulness.

Dr. Charles Hodge gives, on this subject, this striking illustration: "Some members of the body are more important than others; and some books of the Bible could be far better spared than others. There may be as great a difference between St. John's gospel and the Book of Chronicles as between a man's brain and the hair of his head; nevertheless the life of the body is as truly in the hair as in the brain."

We may consider:

I. The Proof of Inspiration.

1. As Dr. Gray has observed: "The Inspiration of the Bible is proved by the philosophy, or what may be called the nature of the case." As we have before observed, we needed to know kinds of truth which the unaided human reason was incapable of discovering. The nature of God, how sin could be forgiven, the origin of man, and his future destiny, had never been known and would not have been, except by a direct revelation from God. That revelation was given, and the Bible is the

History of the Divine method of redeeming the race. But such is the imperfection of man, so fallible in judgment, so feeble in memory, so defective in spirituality, that he would not have given a full, and accurate, and worthy account of it without a supernatural inspiration.

2. This may be further inferred from what has been already said about the genuineness, integrity, credibility, and authenticity of the Bible. Whatever goes to prove that in its fulness, tends also to prove the inspiration.

3. Proof from the character of the Bible, as the Westminster Confession says: "The heavenliness of its matter, the efficacy of its doctrine, the unity of its various parts, the majesty of its style, and the scope and completeness of its design" indicate the divinity of its origin.

The Bible is manifestly a book written to lead men out of sin into holiness. Its great fundamentals are (1) The story of God's infinite love that from eternity purposed to provide salvation for the fallen race of man. (2) To consummate that holy purpose, He sent His Only Begotten Son into the world to make an atonement for human sin. (3) That on the ground of that atonement salvation can be obtained by complying with the simple conditions of repentance and faith.

Now if our Bible and this Christian scheme of salvation is not truthful and of superhuman origin, as infidel critics would have us believe, who were the forgers and fable-mongers clever enough to invent so divine a tale? Who invented the idea of an incarnation? It was "to the Jews a stumbling block, and to the Greeks foolishness." Who put together the picture of the Divine-human Jesus, as He appears in the Gospels? Who conceived the notion of making Him a sinless man, and doing it so successfully that all subsequent generations have been unable to find a flaw in His character? Yet a sinless man had never been seen before, nor has one been seen since on the planet. Who supplied this Jesus with the superhuman power to perform works possible only to God? Whence came the superhuman wisdom that fell from His lips, if He was not a real, but only an imaginary, person? The really great men of the Christian centuries have universally acknowledged that Jesus was immeasurably above them in wisdom and greatness and power. Who was the daring genius that conceived the idea of making atonement for sin, and that, too, by the voluntary sacrifice of the Son of God? Who would have pictured Him as rising from the dead and ascending to heaven in a most skeptical age, when the very immortality of the soul was doubted? These conceptions were so incredible to Jesus' own followers at the first, and so unacceptable to the natural man ever since, that no forger of a religious tale would ever have conceived of them, much less given them to the world as a reality. And who suggested the doctrine of a general resurrection at the end of time, a doctrine which human philosophy can not explain, and has ever laughed to scorn?

"The impartial reasoner must perceive that in all these themes we are dealing not with purely human thoughts, but with thoughts that are divine, and that it is idle to talk of them as fabulous, or untrue or uninspired." 1. Rev. Dr. Thomas Whitelaw, Fundamentals, Vol. III, pp. 88, 89.

Such a genius as would be necessary to invent the New Testament and the character of Jesus, would be vastly more miraculous and more difficult to explain than revelation and inspiration combined. In comparison with Him, these critics, who are drunk with conceit of their own infallible greatness, would be only puling babes.

4. The strongest proof of the Inspiration of Scriptures is the claims of the Bible writers themselves. This would be no proof whatever, apart from the character of the writers, and the character of the Book. But, in view of the holy men who wrote, and the abiding influence of the Book, in every age, and in every clime, and on every class of people, always against sin and in favor of righteousness, we have ample reason to accept the testimony of the authors on this point.

Notice how they acknowledge that they received their messages from God. Dr. James H. Brooks tells us that they use the phrase, "Thus saith the Lord," or its equivalent two thousand times. Matthew quotes from the Old Testament sixty-four times, often introducing the quotation by such words as, "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord, through the prophet, saying" (see Matt. 1: 22 and 2: 15). The New Testament writers believed that the writers of the Old Testament got their message through inspiration. Peter said, "No prophecy ever came by the will of man; but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit. Jesus talked in the same way: "But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" (Matt. 22: 31, 32). After the ascension, Peter stood up in Jerusalem and said: "Brethren, it was needful that the Scripture should be fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit spake by the mouth of David, concerning Judas, who was guide to them that took Jesus" (Acts 1: 16). St. Paul said: "Well spake the Holy Spirit through Isaiah the prophet unto your fathers" (Acts 28: 25). He also wrote to Timothy, "Every Scripture inspired of God, is also profitable," or "Every Scripture is inspired of God and profitable" (2 Tim. 3: 16). Scholars differ as to which is the better Greek reading; but either one has an assertion that God inspired Scripture, and each says "Every Scripture."

Dr. Nathaniel West, commenting upon this verse, says: "The distributive word 'every' is used not only to particularize each individual Scripture of the Canon that Timothy had studied from his youth, but also to include, along with the Old Testament, the New Testament Scriptures extant in Paul's day, and any others, such as those that John wrote after him." Perhaps not every reverent scholar would say so much as Dr. West did on this passage. But it shows what St. Paul and the early Church thought about the inspiration of the Scriptures. And that ancient faith produced the faith of Dr. West and millions of other scholars who would die for that old inspired Book. St. Peter endorsed "all" of St. Paul's epistles as inspired in 2 Peter 3: 16. "Our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given to him, wrote unto you, as also in all his Epistles"

The Epistle to the Hebrews begins thus: "God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions, and in divers manners, hath, at the end of these days, spoken to us in His Son."

But why multiply passages to prove what is so evident to any thoughtful and reverent reader of the holy Book. It goes without saying, that the authors claimed to be inspired, and nobody has ever yet been able to disprove their claim.

II. Extent of Inspiration.

There are various theories among the reverent defenders of the doctrine of inspiration as to the extent of it. Some limit it to the prophetic parts of Scriptures; while others extend it to the doctrinal part also, but not to the historical.

Others maintain that the inspiration of the sacred writers was only occasional; that they were not always, even when writing, under the influence of the Spirit which rendered their writings the unerring word of God; and that consequently, when they were writing without it, they were liable to make mistakes like other men. So that, as a result, there is in the Bible an admixture of error and truth, the human and the divine. The logical difficulty of this theory is that, if it be once granted that there is an alloy of error in the Word, an opening is made for the assumption of every imaginable corruption. To admit that the sacred writers were only occasionally inspired would involve us in the greatest perplexity; for not knowing when they were or were not inspired, we could not determine what parts of their writings should be regarded as the infallible Word of God.

Among the stronger, and seemingly safer and more consistent views of inspiration are,

1. The theory of plenary inspiration. This regards the inspiration as extending to all parts of the Scripture, whether prophetic, doctrinal, or historical. It is held to cover, also, all the separate books, and all the subjects discussed, and all the statements made. So that every statement is always to be looked upon as true and authoritative. This is the view of Dr. Charles Hodge, and he says: "It denies that the sacred writers were merely partially inspired; it asserts that they were fully inspired as to all that they teach whether of doctrine or fact. This of course does not imply that the sacred writers were infallible, except for the special purpose for which they were employed. They were not imbued with plenary knowledge. As to all matters of science, philosophy, and history they stood on the same level with their contemporaries. They were infallible only as teachers, and when acting as the spokesmen of God. Their inspiration no more made them astronomers than it made them agriculturists. Isaiah was infallible in his predictions, although he shared with his countrymen the views then prevalent as to the mechanism of the universe. Paul could not err in anything he taught, although he could not recollect how many persons he had baptized in Corinth. The sacred writers also, doubtless, differed as to insight into the truths which they taught. The apostle Peter intimates that the prophets searched diligently into the meaning of their own predictions."¹ The inspiration extends to everything which any sacred writer asserts to be true. 1. Hodge, Vol. I, p. 165.

2. The theory of verbal inspiration. This is a still stronger theory than the other. It has been thus defined: "By Verbal Inspiration is meant that the inspired servants of God, while they retained the proper use of their powers and faculties, were always guided, or assisted to use such language as would convey 'the mind of the Spirit' in its full and unimpaired integrity."² . . . "Verbal inspiration asserts that there was a concurrence of the act of God with the act of man. (1) He endowed the man with those particular gifts, and chose him to be His particular instrument. (2) He guided his mind in the selection of what he should say, and in the revelation of the material of his writing, where it was necessary through the defect of human knowledge. (3) He acted in and on the intellect and heart of the writer, in the act of committing the words to writing, not only in bestowing a more than human elevation, but securing the truthfulness of the thing written, and moulding the language into the form accordant to His own will. To sum up the whole, verbal inspiration simply amounts to this—that while the words of Scripture are truly and characteristically the words of men, they are at the same time fully and concurrently the words of God."³ 2. Dr. Hannah, quoted by "Field's Theology," p. 74. 3. Field's Theology, p. 75.

Strong as this statement is, there is much in the Scripture to support it. A large portion of the entire Bible consists in direct messages from God, e. g., a large part of Exodus, most of Leviticus, much of Deuteronomy and Numbers, the greater part of the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Zechariah, Zephaniah, Habakkuk and Malachi, also much of the New Testament.

Such words, and texts, as the following are very significant. "Thus saith the Lord," "The Spirit of God said," "Howbeit when He, the Spirit of truth is come, He shall guide you into all the truth, for He shall not speak from himself; but what things, soever He shall hear, these shall He speak" (John 16: 13). "Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth" (Jer. 1: 9 and Isaiah 51: 15). "For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of man, but as it is in truth the word of God" (1 Thess. 2: 13). St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians: "My speech and my preaching were not in persuasive words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power; that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God. . . . Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth, combining spiritual things with spiritual words" (1 Cor. 2:4, 5, 13).

Paul wrote to the Galatians: "I marvel that ye are so quickly removing from Him that called you in the grace of Christ unto a different gospel. . . . But though we or an angel from heaven should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him, be Anathema. . . . For I make known unto you brethren, as touching the Gospel which was preached by me that it is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it; but it came to me through the revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. 1: 6-11). Paul tells the Ephesians where he got his Gospel: "If so be that ye have heard of the dispensation of that grace of God which was given me to you-ward; how that by revelation was made known unto me the mystery, as I wrote before in few words; whereby, when ye read, ye can perceive my understanding in the mystery of Christ; which in other generations was not made known unto the Sons of men, as it hath now been revealed unto His holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit" (Eph. 3: 2-5).

Such verbal inspiration is always affirmed of Jesus. It was foretold of Him: "I will put my words in His mouth and He shall speak unto them all that I shall command Him." Jesus always spoke so of His own utterances. "The things which I heard from Him, these speak I unto the world" (John 8: 26). "As the Father hath taught me I speak these things" (28). "But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I heard from God" (verse 40). "I spake not from myself; but the Father that sent me, He hath given me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak, and I know that His commandment is life eternal; the things therefore which I speak even as the Father hath said unto me, so I speak" (John 12: 49, 50). "He had given commandment through the Holy Spirit unto the apostles whom He had chosen" (Acts 1:2). "The Revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave Him to show unto His servants" (Rev. 1:1).

It has been well asked, "If the incarnate Word needed the unction of the Holy Ghost to give to men the revelation He received from the Father, in whose bosom He dwells, . . . how much more must it be so in the case of ordinary men?"

From these statements of the Bible writers themselves it is evident that very much at least of the Bible is verbally inspired, so that the authors recorded the very words God would have them use.

We have stated the two strongest theories of inspiration the plenary and the verbal, and pointed out the evidence that may fairly be advanced in their defence, in respect to a considerable portion of the Bible. But to say that all the Scripture was So inspired, is to put too great a tax upon faith. In view of discrepancies, and disagreements and misquotations, or inaccurate quotations, and the manifestly lower moral and spiritual tone in some passages than in others, these strong theories, if applied to the whole Bible cannot be successfully defended. "The theory of a common verbal inspiration is beset with very serious difficulties-enough indeed to disprove it" (Miley). A universal plenary inspiration of the Scripture, especially as we have it now, faces the same difficulty. "It is impossible to prove absolute inspiration, in the sense claimed. The Scriptures do not affirm it, and no other proof is possible. It might be safely claimed that there is marvelous accuracy, even in the geographical and historical statements, and marvelous wisdom in reference to all matters of science-such wisdom as seems to imply divine guidance; securing, the use of popular expressions which are always appropriate, and the avoidance of all technical terms which imply a scientific theory. But to go farther and claim the absolute accuracy of all minute statement of fact, or the absolute harmony of all these statements with one another-this is a task which the broadest and most thorough scholarship would not undertake. . . . But if the inspiration of the original text were absolute and complete, and were absolutely proved, no one can maintain that we have that original text in every minute particular. Again the canon has not been determined by inspiration. Still again there is no absolutely inspired translator or Interpreter of the Scriptures; and honest and earnest and scholarly men differ widely upon the translation and interpretation of many important passages." "Those who maintain this absolute inspiration, put themselves at a disadvantage. They feel obliged to explain every difficulty, or discrepancy, important, or unimportant; because their theory makes no provision even for minute differences" (Fairchild).

3. There is a theory called Essential Inspiration which holds that the Scriptures are inspired to such a degree as to present, with all required fullness and accuracy, the great truths which it is the purpose of Scripture to present. There is also the Dynamical Theory, which holds that there is a supernatural operation of the Spirit within the consciousness and appropriate faculties of the mediate agent. Through the agency of the Holy Spirit He is so enlightened and possessed of the truth, and so guided in its expression, that the truth so given forth, whether by the spoken or written word, is from God. Through this agency, the true and sufficient authorship of the Scriptures is with the Holy Spirit. This Dynamical theory leaves a proper place for the human element, yet in a sense entirely consistent with the true and proper authorship of the Holy Spirit. This theory avoids the insuperable difficulties of a plenary and verbal inspiration throughout all the Scriptures. "The Scriptures are as really a divine revelation on this theory as they could be on that of verbal inspiration. This can be true and is true, because an exact set of words, dictated by the Spirit, is not necessary either to the truthful expression of the divine mind, or to the divine authorship of the Scriptures" (Miley).

4. The theory of Moral Inspiration. This theory limits the inspiration to the moral and religious instruction which the Bible contains. In the matter of conveying religious truth alone, is it inerrant and authoritative. Those who hold this view are often most devout Christian men. They think that the Bible is so inspired that it is a perfectly safe guide to salvation and heaven. It is a common

saying with those who hold this view that the Bible contains a Word of God; but is not all of it the Word of God. It is believed by the Advocates of this theory that it obviates the difficulty arising from the admitted, though relatively insignificant, errors, discrepancies, contradictions, and interpolations that are known to have crept into the text, and are admittedly found in the sacred writings.

There is a measure of truth in this theory, that the Bible is certainly a safe moral and spiritual guide; and that, aside from all human elements, there is a Word of God. But the theory is stated so loosely and held so carelessly that it is open to grave objections which have been stated as follows: 1. "What part is spiritual truth? 2. What are the value and authority of the portions of Scripture which do not deal with this? Who will undertake the task of making the separation? What and how much of the Bible would be left to us, when the different advocates of this theory have each performed the part of Jehoiakim's penknife? Infallibility, in the sense of entire freedom from errors in the Bible, such as arise from errors of copyists and other contingences to which all ancient manuscripts are liable, we do not insist upon; but that the Bible is not only a sufficient witness to the truth of Salvation, but one that is rich and abundant in other truth above measure." 1. Field's Theology, p. 60.

III. The Degree of Inspiration.

This refers to the action of the Holy Spirit upon the inspired writer. To what extent was he acted upon. Theologians have mentioned superintendence, elevation, and suggestion. Let us briefly consider the nature of each.

1. Superintendence. This term signifies that controlling influence of the Holy Spirit by which the sacred writers, in relating what they knew by ordinary means, were preserved from error, and divinely guided as to what they should record.

There were many things that Moses and the other historians, and the authors of the Gospels and the Acts knew which are not recorded. They did not need a revelation to inform them of what passed before their eyes. But they did need an inspiration to enable them to be accurate, and a superintendence, to guide them as to what, out of the vast abundance of material at hand, they should select to record, and what they should leave unrecorded.

Nothing is more impressive to any thoughtful literary man than the sacred writings, in respect to their surprising brevity; their graphic descriptions, their matchless picture of the Son of God, and the statement of sublimest doctrines, all drawn in the fewest possible words, without introducing one opinion or personal reflection of their own into the sacred narrative. A little illustration will make this plain. The best four lives of Christ in the English language are said to be Andrews', Geikie's, Hanna's and Edersheim's. The four combined have no less than 5,490 large pages. But Bagster prints our four Gospels, which are simply inspired biographies of Christ, in eighty-two pages; Matthew occupies but twenty-three pages, and Mark but thirteen! Who taught the evangelists this superhuman power of condensation and graphic statement, sifting the vast mass of material, and treasuring the gems of truth, without note or comment of their own? There can be but one answer. The Spirit of God superintended their minds and pens with His unerring wisdom.

2. Elevation, denotes that Divine influence by which the mental faculties of the sacred writers, even though acting naturally, were raised to an extraordinary degree of power and skill. Therefore their writings exhibit a felicitous choice of words, a charm of style, a dignity of expression, and a power of statement entirely beyond what their natural gifts could have achieved, fitly clothing the heavenly truths they taught.

It seemed to matter little whether the author was educated or unlearned, whether he was the trained Law-giver, or the Poet-King, or the Unknown Son of Amoz, or the Herdman of Tekoa, or the Gatherer of Sycomore fruit, or the Tax-collector or the beloved Physician, or the Fisherman of Galilee. However untrained or illiterate they were in themselves, when the inspiring Holy Spirit selected them to write the sacred Word, they were at once lifted above themselves. Where an uninspired writer would have been inclined to attempt to heighten the impression by glowing and elaborate description, these preserved a chastened simplicity. "These sober recorders of events the most astonishing, are never carried away by the circumstances they relate, into any pomp of diction or use of superlatives. Absorbed in their holy task, no alien idea presents itself to their mind. The object before them engrosses their whole attention. They never digress, are never drawn aside from their purpose by personal vanity. They never fill up the intervals between the events which they record. They leave the events to make their own impression, instead of trying to help the reader by reflections of their own. They preserve the gravity of history and the severity of truth, without any exaggeration or appeals to emotion. Yet they often burst forth in strains of eloquence and sublimity of thought and expression not equalled in profane literature. The only explanation is that they wrote as they were inspired by the Holy Spirit.

3. Suggestion. This, as treated by the theologians who use these terms, is the highest degree of inspiration, and includes all those direct revelations which were made to the sacred writers, of such things as they could not have discovered by ordinary means.

Of course this is confusing revelation and inspiration, which differ from each other in critically accurate discussion. But all writings on the subject of inspiration sooner or later seem to make it include revelation. In this larger meaning, suggestion would be supremely important. It is manifest to every reverent mind that the subjects of which much Scripture treats were matters that needed to be revealed. They could not have been discovered by the natural mind of man, however elevated. No angel was great enough to pry into the secrets of the Divine Mind and discover His plans and purposes, and communicate them to mortal men. Such truths, therefore, could not have been known save as they were communicated by the omniscient God. How God proposed to save men, what would be the fate of various nations and the fate of his own kingdom, and the destinies of men, only God could make known.

It is even doubtful if the prophets often half understood their own sublime messages, which the inspiring Spirit gave them. "They sought and searched diligently . . . what the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto" (1 Peter 1: 10, 11). And some of the truths they taught even "the angels desired to look into."

And so in all these ways, and often in all of them combined, "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost"; and we most properly call their combined writings "The Word of God." The several authors were taught, elevated, divinely guided, and led into truth, and kept from

error and folly, by the inspiring Spirit. It reaches the hearts of men, and moulds human society, and influences it for good as does no other book that was ever written, because in its pages we hear from heaven, and listen to the voice of the Infinite God. Its histories are true, its promises are faithful, its precepts are gracious, its warnings are helpful, its "commandments are true and righteous altogether; and in the keeping of them there is great reward."

4. There is another theory called the mechanical theory of inspiration. It is usually discussed under the subject-"the mode of inspiration." It holds that the personality of the authors was superseded or set aside, and inspired men were used by the Spirit of God as a typist might use his typewriter. Others have reduced the sacred writer to a mere amanuensis, simply recording indifferently what was dictated by God.

None of these figures of speech are fortunate, or true to fact. The Christian Church, as a whole, has never held to the mechanical theory of inspiration, or to any theory that approximates to it. The sacred writers were never reduced to machines. It was "men" not machines, "that spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." Their self-consciousness was not suspended, nor their intellectual powers superseded, nor their personality set aside. The authors were not unconscious instruments, but living, breathing, thinking, feeling, emotional men, preserving their own peculiar individuality, but still inspired and used by God. The inspired penmen wrote out of the fulness of their own hearts and thoughts, and employed language which at the time seemed to them the most fit. Yet none the less God was using them to convey His own messages to men.

Some most devout believers in the Bible, think that the exact words of the Scriptures were not always dictated by the Spirit. In the "histories, moral reflections, and devotional pieces, they do not contend for the inspiration of the language in the same sense" as in prophecies and commands and teachings of truths revealed by God. But even then, while the writers were using their own knowledge, and powers of expression, and language and modes of thought, when most at liberty, they were still under a restraining and guiding influence of God.

IV. Difficulties and Objections.

Difficulties may be suggested and clever objections may be raised against any and all of these theories. Materialists and all kindred thinkers, who deny the existence of a personal, extra-mundane God, of course must deny inspiration. If the supernatural is impossible, inspiration would be impossible.

There is also a large class of skeptics of every name and hue, who deny the need of any revelation, and are therefore quite prepared to reject the inspiration of any book that claims to be inspired by the Spirit of God.

Then there are the infidel higher critics whose sole aim is to break down all confidence in the authenticity and credibility of the Book. By their very aim and purpose, they are logically compelled to deny the inspiration of these writings. They must do it to be consistent with their own infidel theories.

Others deny inspiration because they do not understand what the doctrine means. They have picked up some fallacious definitions of inspiration which have appeared, and have rejected with derision the idea of "automaton compositors." But no accredited theologian teaches that inspiration transformed the sacred writers into machines and "automatons." Such objectors are only opposing a man of straw of their own invention.

There are, however, other objections arising from disagreements, discrepancies, interpolations, and inaccurate quotations from the Old Testament by writers in the New Testament, and various readings which do have a basis in facts.

We can say to these that:

1. We admit that we have not at this age of the world, the accurate Books, as they first came from the hands of the authors. We have alluded to this before, and called attention to the comparative insignificance of these defects from the mistakes of copyists. But it does make it true that we no longer have an absolutely inerrant Bible. We may, affirm, however, that all this does not militate against the original inspiration of the Holy Word.

We saw in the Louvre in Paris, two years ago, the famous portrait of Mona Lisa, by Leonardo da Vinci, said to, be the finest portrait painting in the world, and of priceless value. It has since been stolen, but has been found and is now restored to its place. If we had as nearly an exact copy of it as any artist could make, with a fly-speck on it, we should not, 1. Deny that Leonardo painted Mona Lisa. 2. Neither would we argue that he painted the fly-speck. 3. Neither would we insist that the fly-speck was not there. Let us be honest on all sides when we talk about the Bible; or the Book itself will rebuke us for untruthfulness.

2. If we knew all the facts, these trivial discrepancies, could probably most of them be satisfactorily explained. But some of them would doubtless remain, as unexplainable. They are the human elements that have accrued in the transmission through the ages of our blessed Bible. We are grieved when defenders of the Word deny these disagreements; for it does not seem to be honest.

3. These inaccurate quotations from the Old Testament by the New, do lend color to an argument against universal verbal inspiration. It looks as if the inspired writers often thought more of the truth than they did of the exact words, that expressed it. Compare Isaiah 59: 20 with Romans 11: 26 and Amos 9: 11 with Acts 15: 16. There are scores of such inaccurate quotations.

We are compelled to conclude that two outstanding facts are absolutely incompatible with the theory of universal verbal inspiration.

- (1) The first of these is the manner in which quotations from the Old Testament are made in the New. Remember that the Old Testament generally used in Christ's day and for centuries before was the Septuagint, Greek translation of the original Hebrew writings. "But the Septuagint is, to a considerable extent, different from our (Hebrew) Bible. Not only are incidents in the life of David, which we read in our text, omitted from the Septuagint, but in a prophet so important as Jeremiah about one-eighth of what we find in the Hebrew is omitted from the Greek, while the arrangement

of the material widely differs. No one can tell us which of these texts, the Hebrew we now use, or the Hebrew translated by the Septuagint, is nearer the original.

Now, of the quotations made from these differing Old Testaments (Hebrew, and Greek Septuagint), there are two hundred and seventy-five in the New Testament.

a. Of these there are only 53 in which the Hebrew, the Septuagint and the New Testament agree; that is, in which the Septuagint correctly translated the Hebrew, and has been correctly quoted by the New Testament writer,

b. There are 10 interesting passages in which the Septuagint has been corrected, and brought into harmony with the Hebrew.

c. There are 37 passages in which the faulty rendering of the Septuagint has been accepted and repeated in the New Testament quotation... 37.

d. There are 76 passages in which the correct version of the Septuagint, has been altered into a rendering which does not agree with the original... 76.

e. And there are 99 passages in which the New Testament quotations differ both from the Hebrew and from the Septuagint. 99

Now the above statistics prove that the New Testament writers thought much more of the sense of the sacred Scriptures than of the exact language, and that they set no special store by the exact words in which the Old Testament writers expressed themselves.

(2) The second fact of Scripture which appears to be incompatible with the idea of (universal) verbal inspiration, is the fact that those who record the sayings of our Lord greatly differ in their reports. One would expect that here if anywhere, sacredness would attach to the very letter and precise language used. But it is not so. Even in reporting the Lord's Prayer the evangelists differ; and in His ordinary sayings and conversations we congratulate ourselves if the sense is the same in the different Gospels, and scarcely expect to find absolute identity of language. But if inspiration involved perfect accuracy of language no such phenomena as the Gospels present would appear. It would seem, then, that not always the very words, but the man himself is inspired, so that he with all his natural powers and idiosyncrasies, becomes the organ of the Spirit. Inspiration does not lift the inspired person out of all his limitations, but uses him as he is, and all his faculties as they are, for the fulfilment of a Divine purpose.

Abandoning, then the theory of possession (and universal verbal inspiration) as untenable, we find a proposed relief from its inconsistencies in the theory that the Divine energy did not annihilate the human co-operation. The Divine influence was dominant, but not overpowering" (Marcus Dod's "The Bible; Its Origin and Nature," pp. 113-118).

In the human element there is always room for inaccuracy. Many have thought that the difficulty would be escaped, and the accuracy of Scripture sufficiently guaranteed if it were held that God inspired the thoughts, but not always at least the words; that the truths are communicated by the

Holy Spirit; but the form, the words and the phrases in which they are delivered, are often due to the writer's own individuality.

The Infallibility of Scripture.

"Criticism justly and with virtually unanimous voice declares that literal inerrancy cannot be claimed for the books either of the Old or New Testament, that Scripture is not absolutely free, from error. Mark quotes Malachi under the name of Isaiah; and Matthew ascribes to Jeremiah words spoken by Zechariah. Now there are three methods of dealing with these and other more serious findings of criticism.

(1) The first is to deny the existence of these or any errors.

(2) The second is to admit the errors, and to infer from their existence that the Bible is untrustworthy, not infallible.

(3) The third is to admit the errors, while at the same time maintaining and exhibiting the infallibility of the Bible notwithstanding.

The first method seems likely to blind men to the true nature of the Bible, and to lead to disingenuousness, mischief, and unbelief. The second method is the result of ignorance, and especially of a misunderstanding of infallibility. The third gives us a sure standing ground, and leads us to recognize the actual infallibility of Scripture; that (in spite of errors) the Bible remains the infallible and authoritative Word of God. It is truly said that "the man who binds up the cause of Christianity with the literal accuracy of the Bible, is no friend of Christianity; for with the rejection of that theory, too often comes the rejection of the Bible itself, and faith is shattered." Those who maintain that we must accept every statement of Scripture, or none of it, should consider that no doctrine more surely makes skeptics. "It seems," says Dr. Stearns, "a very good and pious thing to insist that the Bible is absolutely without error. But nothing is good or pious that is contrary to facts."

But, in spite of all discrepancies, and disagreements, and errors, and minor inaccuracies, the Bible still remains God's inspired and infallible book. But infallible for what? The whole matter hinges here. What is the infallibility we claim for the Bible? It is infallible as regards the purpose for which it was written. It is infallible as a revelation of God's saving love in Christ to a wicked world. It infallibly guides all honest, and willing and seeking souls, to Christ, to holiness, and to heaven (Marcus Dod's "The Bible," etc., pp. 135-155).

(4) The marvel and the miracle is that there are so few discrepancies of any real importance. Considering that the different books of the Bible were written by men of different degrees of culture, scattered through a period of more than fifteen hundred years, it is unaccountable that they should have such moral agreement on any other hypothesis than that the various writers were under the common guidance of the Spirit of God. In this respect the Bible stands alone. "It is enough to fill any mind with awe, when it contemplates the Sacred Scriptures filled with the highest truths, speaking with authority in the name of God, and so won-drously free from the soiling touch of human fingers. The errors in matter of fact which skeptics search out bear no proportion to the

whole. No sane man would deny that the Parthenon was built of marble, even if, here and there, a speck of sandstone or granite should be detected in its structure. Not less unreasonable is it to deny the inspiration of such a book as the Bible, because one sacred writer says that on a given occasion twenty-four, and another says that twenty-three thousand, men were slain. Surely a Christian may be allowed to tread such objections under his feet."1 1. Hodge, Vol. I, p. 170.

(5) Let it be noted that the hardest theory to defend concerning inspiration is that which denies it altogether. The next most difficult are those which entertain low and loose views of inspiration. The stronger theories are those most scriptural, most logical and most rational, and have the authority of God on their side- To deny inspiration is akin to all the other infidel attacks upon the wonderful Book that has produced our civilization, of which our times are so rife.

And this is not all. The vast majority of the real scholars of the Christian centuries have been devout believers in, and loyal defenders of this inspired Book. Their name is legion in every great field of human effort. Also the effective workers in the kingdom of Christ, the great teachers and soul winning evangelists, and mighty preachers who made an impress upon their times, and lifted the masses heavenward, and left a bright wake of holy influence behind them as they crossed the seas of human life,-the men who have built up States and shaped civilizations, have been men of profound faith in the inspired oracles of God. It should be esteemed a privilege for the very strongest of us to be numbered among them.

* * * * *

CHAPTER VI -- AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURES

We have seen that the Scriptures are Genuine, and Authentic and Inspired. It still remains for us to consider very briefly what reasons we have for regarding them as authoritative on all questions of morals and religion, duty and human conduct. Is the Bible the supreme authority in every matter of spiritual truth vital to the soul in this life? As illuminated by the Spirit, is it the last court of appeal?

We maintain the affirmative, on the following grounds:

1. The miracles of the Bible give its teachings authority. That was their purpose. Pharaoh was to know that God was speaking authoritatively to him through Moses, by the miracles he wrought. When the Children of Israel were led miraculously across the Jordan by Joshua, "On that day the Lord magnified Joshua in the sight of all Israel; and they feared him as they feared Moses, all the days of his life." The miracles gave his words divine authority.

When Elijah could lock up the skies that there should be neither dew nor rain for three years and six months, it made his message to Ahab authoritative. When he could call fire from the skies he had a right to demand judgment upon the false prophets that were leading the people to their doom.

He who could control the elements supernaturally, had a right to say to a guilty people "Thus saith the Lord." In like manner Jesus could point to His miracles as a proof of His authority. And His apostles after Him, by the signs and wonders they wrought, knew that they had a message from

heaven. When a holy prophet or apostle gave valid evidence that he had a message from the Most High, he could with perfect propriety, demand to be heard and obeyed. So the mighty miracles of the Bible, so benevolent and worthy of God, and so well attested by historic evidence, stamp the Book with Divinity and make its holy sayings and sublime doctrines the voice of God to the heart, from which there is no appeal.

2. Akin to miracles, is prophecy, as an evidence of the authority of the Sacred Word. Prophecy is a miracle of knowledge. It is a declaration or foretelling of some future event, beyond the power of human sagacity to discover or to calculate. Prophecies thus belong to the same category as miracles. They are deviations from the established laws of obtaining knowledge, and their purpose is the same. They are not designed to gratify an idle wonder or a vain curiosity, but for the manifestation of the mind of God and to show His presence and power in human history, for the encouragement and guidance of His creatures. "There is, however," says Field, "one very manifest difference between miracles of power, and miracles of knowledge. The former usually produce the greatest impression upon those who actually witness their occurrence; while prophecy, in the nature of things, makes its strongest appeal to posterity. The evidence of miracles is as full at first as it ever will be; that of prophecy goes on increasing from age to age."

Prophecy to have authoritative value must have four characteristics. 1. There must be evidence that the prophecy was uttered before the event, and was not palmed off as a prophecy after it. 2. That the event was such as could not be conjectured by any human sagacity. 3. That the prophecy should be so full and definite that there could be no chance of accidental coincidence of prediction and event. 4. That the event should have a striking and full correspondence to the prediction, and be so public that it is undeniable.

Such is the nature of a multitude of the Bible prophecies. The prophecies of Moses as to the future fate of Israel given in Deuteronomy 28, hundreds of years afterward came true so literally as to fill the soul with awe that meditates upon it.

The destruction of Nineveh was foretold by Nahum (3), and the destruction of Babylon was foretold by Isaiah (13), and Ezekiel (31), and the destruction of Tyre by Jeremiah (47), and Zechariah (9) when these cities were in the height of power and prosperity, and none but the omniscient mind could foresee their downfall. The succession of the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Grecian and the Roman Empires, and other historic events far down the centuries, were foretold by Daniel with surprising accuracy and minuteness of detail. No wonder infidels hate and try to undermine the book of Daniel! They have reason to.

But "the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." He and His kingdom are the great themes of prophetic vision. (1-) He was to be the seed of the woman that was to bruise the serpent's head. (2) He was to be of the seed of Abraham. (3) He was to be of the Tribe of Judah. (4) Of the House of David. "There shall be a Root of Jesse." "I will raise unto David a righteous Branch." Isa. 11: 10 and Jer. 33: 5, 6. (5) He was to be born in Bethlehem, Micah 4: 2. (6) He was to be born while the second temple was still standing. Hag. 2: 7, 9. Dan. 9: 24. The time of His coming was so accurately foretold that even profane historians tell us that the coming of a great person was expected. (7) He was to be preceded by a remarkable person resembling Elijah. Mal. 3: 1, 4: 5 and Isa. 40: 3. (8) He was to work miracles. Isa. 35: 5, 6. (9) He was to have a public entry into

Jerusalem. Zech. 9: 9. (10) He was to be rejected of His own countrymen. Isa. 8: 14. (11) He was to be despised and rejected of men. Isa. 53:2, 3. (12) He was to be scourged and mocked. Isa. 50: 6. (13) His hands and feet were to be pierced. Psa. 22: 16. (14) He was to be numbered with transgressors. Isa. 53: 12. (15) He was to be mocked and reviled. Ps. 22: 7, 8. (16) He was to have gall and vinegar to drink. Psa. 69: 21. (17) His price was to be thirty pieces of silver. Zech. 11: 12. (18) His death was to be violent. Isa. 53: 8 and Dan. 9: 26. (19) His garments were to be parted by lot. Psa. 22: 18. John 19: 23. (20) He was to be pierced. Zech. 12: 10. John 19:34. (21) He was to make His grave with the rich. Isa. 53: 9. (22) He was not to see corruption. Psa. 16: 10 and Acts 2: 29-31. (23) He was to be born of a Virgin. Isa. 7: 14. Matt. 1: 23. Luke 1: 35. (24) He was to be driven down to Egypt. Hosea 11: 1. Matt. 2: 14-15. (25) He was to be called "God." Isa. 9: 6. John 20: 28. (26) He was to be "an offering for sin." Isa. 53:10. Matt. 20:28. 1 Tim. 2:6. (27) He was to be "a prophet like unto Moses." Deut. 18: 18. Acts 3: 22. (28) He was to be "a priest." Psa. 110: 4. Heb. 5: 10. (29) He was to be "a King." Psa. 2: 6. Matt. 28: 18. 1 Cor. 15:, 25. (30) He was to be "a kingdom of peace." Isa. 9: 6, 7. Micah 4: 3. (31) It was to include the Gentiles. Isa. 49: 6. Isa. 60: 3-5.

This list of these wonderful prophecies is by no means complete. But we have pointed out enough to show that the divine foreknowledge of God was in this matchless Book. We see how Christ could not be born, or be hunted by a King's malice, or be betrayed by a traitor disciple, or be scourged, and rejected by Jews; His foes could not mock His dying agonies, nor the soldiers nail Him to the cross, and coolly sit down and gamble for His garments, without fulfilling Scripture-prophecy, uttered hundreds of years before.

And yet there are those who, with brazen impudence, tell us that these are no prophecies, and were never claimed to be, thus flatly contradicting scores of passages in the New Testament. But when we see these passages brought together; when we behold their remarkable convergence, so that the history of Christ from His ancestry and birth to His unusual death was only their counterpart; when we find that the Jews themselves referred most of them to the Messiah, and that they are expressly claimed by Christ and His apostles, the argument becomes exceedingly strong. Let all the infidel critics unite their wisdom, and try to apply one third of them to any other man that ever lived, and see how they will succeed. "If we admit that these prophecies were extant before the coming of Christ-and of that we have absolutely unquestionable evidence, because, as was said by an ancient father, the Jews, the enemies of Christianity, were the librarians of Christians,-and if we estimate mathematically by the doctrine of chances, the probability, that these circumstances would meet in one person, it would, as is said by Dr. Gregory, surpass the powers of numbers to express the immense improbability of its taking place."¹ 1. Mark Hopkins' Evidences, pp. 318, 319.

Many of these prophecies were seemingly incompatible. So much so that they did perplex the Jews of Christ's own day. He was to be at once a prophet, priest, and King; he was to be a triumphant conqueror, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling all nations, while also He was to be "despised and rejected of men," "oppressed and afflicted." It was said of His reign, "Of the increase of His government there shall be no end," and also that "after three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off." What contradictions! A King who is to be "cut off" and slain, and yet is to have universal dominion and to reign forever. And, still, the demands of these seemingly incompatible prophecies are met in Christ."

And these prophecies were fulfilled not by any shrewd plots of Christ's friends, but by His enemies themselves. As St. Paul said, "They that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew Him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets, which are read every Sabbath day, they have fulfilled them in condemning Him." It was enemies, who would have been the last people in the world to prove His Messiahship by fulfilling prophecies, that hung Him on a tree, and paid thirty pieces of silver for Him, and afterward bought the potter's field with the price of His blood.

Nor is this all. The Old Testament dispensation, the ark of the Covenant, with all its arrangements, the passover, the sacrifices, the ceremonies, the priesthood, were all typical, and therefore prophetic; and the true import and substance of all of them is to be found in Christ's atonement and great salvation.

Still further, Jesus Himself prophesied. "Before the time of Christ and during His life, no false Christ arose; there was no war, and no prospect of one; and the Temple, and Jerusalem, were standing in all their strength. But He foretold that false Christs should arise, and should deceive many; that there should be earthquakes and famines, and fearful sights in heaven, and wars and rumors of wars, and great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world, nor ever should be; and that Jerusalem should be compassed with armies; and that a trench should be cast round about it; and that one stone of the temple should not be left upon another; and that the Jews should be carried captive among all nations." Josephus verifies all these predictions to the letter. He was an eyewitness and a Jew, and nothing can be more striking than the comparison of his history with the prophecy. He tells of "fearful sights and great signs from heaven"; that "before sunset, chariots, and troops of soldiers in their armor, were seen running about among the clouds." "At the feast of Pentecost, as the priests were going by night into the inner court of the Temple, they felt a quaking, and heard a great noise, and, after that, they heard the sound as of a multitude, saying, 'Let us depart hence!'"

Tacitus, a Roman historian, also says, "There were many prodigies presignifying their ruin which was not averted by all the sacrifices and vows of that people. Armies were seen fighting in the air with brandished weapons. A fire fell upon the Temple from the clouds. The doors of the Temple were suddenly opened. At the same time there was a loud voice saying that the gods were removing, which was accompanied with a sound as of a multitude going out. All which things were supposed, by some to portend great calamities." 1 1. Hopkins' Evidences, pp. 322-324.

Josephus further says that "no other city ever suffered such miseries; nor was there ever a generation more fruitful in wickedness from the beginning of the world... In reality it was God who condemned the whole nation and turned every course that was taken for their preservation to their destruction. . . . The multitudes of those who perished exceeded all the destructions that man or God ever brought upon the world."

Famine did its slow but dreadful work so that women were known to eat their own children, just as Moses said they would do, fifteen hundred years before. The prophecy of Christ that not one stone of the Temple should be left upon another, was literally fulfilled. The Jews were carried into captivity among all nations, and their condition from that time till now has been an impressive proof of the truth of prophecy.

That noble scholar and Christian educator, Mark Hopkins, gives this wise summary: "Thus, whether we look at the prophecies which related to events before the time of Christ, or to those relating to Him, or to those which He uttered, or to the present state of the Jews, and, indeed, of the world, as indicating a complete fulfillment of the prophecies, we shall see the fullest reason to believe that 'the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but that holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost'."1 "Fools, make a mock at sin." Kindred fools mock at prophecy; but wiser souls bow in reverence to the authority of this old prophetic Book, because they hear in its wonderful words the voice of God. 1. Hopkins' Evidences, p. 326.

3. Still stronger ground for the authority of Scriptures comes from internal evidence. The proper development of this theme would fill a volume. We can only hint at some of the main truths.

(1) What the Bible reveals about the nature and attributes of God is analogous to the teachings of natural religion; but it is vastly more complete and plain. It is free from polytheism on the one hand, and pantheism on the other, and has given to the world such a conception of a personal, spiritual and infinitely holy God, as to revolutionize human thought.

(2) The Bible teaches the perfection of natural and moral law. How natural, in the light of the holy Book, does it seem that the same God, who, in the universal control of His natural law, no more neglects the minutest particle than the largest planet, should also in His moral law, take notice of every word, and of the thoughts and intents of the heart.

(3) The Bible meets every moral need of man. There is not a great practical fact which a moral being can desire to know, concerning which it does not speak with perfect distinctness.

The facts of a particular providence, of the freedom of man, of his dependence upon God, of the mercy of God to believing penitents, of the immortality of the soul, the fact of a full and perfect accountability to God, of the resurrection from the dead, and a future judgment, with its attendant rewards and penalties, and the need of holiness to meet God in peace,-each is made known with ample fulness and explicitness of statement. Men are not left in doubt about either duty or destiny.

(4) The spiritual revelations of the Bible are in harmony with nature in that both are infinite. Burke said: "What subject is there that does not branch out into infinity?" Sir Isaac Newton, in studying nature, compared himself to a "child picking up pebbles on the beach, while the great ocean of truth is still before him." So the great Book tells us of the eternity that is past, and its teachings lead on into that which is to come. The Bible dwarfs the interests of time, and makes them petty, in comparison with the stupendous issues of eternity.

(5) Both nature and the Bible teach a remedial system. Does nature seek to heal up a bruise on a tree, or knit together the ragged ends of a broken bone? The Bible tells of the grace of God that would cure earth's sorrows, and heal the wounds and diseases of sinsick hearts.

(6) The Bible bears the test of Conscience. However enlightened it may be, by study and meditation, it can never get more than abreast with the Holy Word. There is no principle of moral government, no single course of action, not a temper of mind, approved by it which the most enlightened conscience does not endorse as right. The consciences of the most candid and

intelligent men are compelled to admit the perfection of the moral teachings of the Scriptures. It enjoins the universal, law of love. The universal law of gravitation no more certainly binds all worlds to their orbit in absolute obedience, than this law of love holds every moral being to the discharge of every holy obligation. The Bible utters no precept opposed to it.

(7) The Bible teaches a perfect morality. Other religions have divorced morality. They have had no vital relation between them. But our Bible reveals a religion that comes from a holy God, who demands holiness in every moral being. Man could never have originated such a system of morals. It is intimately connected with the revelations of a holy Father in Heaven, and His government over His children, and the spotless character of the Son of God. It cannot be separated from a living faith in God, and His Son, Jesus Christ.

Madame De Stael said: "If Christ had simply taught men to say 'Our Father' He would have been the greatest benefactor of the race." This is true because it would teach a perfect morality. The child should be like the Holy Father.

(8) The Bible is directly calculated to lead man to his highest possible development. First, it would, if obeyed, deliver us from those vices that dwarf the intellect and check the growth of the spiritual man. Then it exalts the truth as worthy of all pursuit. It looks humanity in the eye, and says, "Buy the truth and sell it not." Even Jesus said, "I came to bear witness to the truth," and he prayed, "Sanctify them through the truth." The Bible claims truth as the right of the human soul. This was the fundamental principle of the Reformation, and it is the mainspring of all human progress.

Still further, it stimulates the affections and gives the heart of man an object worthy of his deepest love. A historian says, "the ancient classic world, was a world without love." But Jesus gave us such revelations of God, that He taught us to love the Father and Himself with all our hearts. This indirectly teaches us to love one another. The twin truths, the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man lighten the whole sky of human thought.

No other religion ever did this. No other sacred book ever taught it. The love of God never entered as an essential element into any heathen religion; nor, with their conceptions of God, was it possible. The heathen gods and goddesses could not call forth moral admiration, much less affection. They never displayed virtues, or made disinterested sacrifices for the good of men. Their characters were neither lovely nor lovable. From the very constitution of our minds, it was impossible to regard them with admiring affection. But our Bible reveals a God that satisfies the intellect, appeals to the conscience, and calls forth the purest devotion of the heart.

(9) The Bible stimulates and exalts the imagination. Nothing in all classic literature compares with its descriptions of God, who "dwelleth in light that no man can approach unto," "who filleth the heaven, and whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain"; "Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of His hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance," . . . "that stretched out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in," . . . "Behold He taketh up the isles as a very little thing." "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed

the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God. . . . Of old thou hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hand."

"The faculty of imagination," says Stewart, "is the great spring of human activity, and the principle source of human improvement." Be it so. What biographies appeal to imagination like those of Holy Writ? What poetic imagery is so exalted? Where can its eloquence be matched? There are no conceivable scenes of grandeur equal to the resurrection of the dead, the conflagration of the world, the assembling of the moral universe for judgment, and the dispensing of final awards and penalties. Nothing can be more entrancing than the revelations of the New Jerusalem, and the future state and blessedness of the finally redeemed. The glory of the millennial day, and the purity and grandeur of the Christian's heaven, utterly eclipse any future ever imagined by the unaided mind of man.

(10) The Bible exalts and ennobles the human will. It always appeals to man as the sovereign arbiter of his own destiny. It arouses the will to action through the intellect, the sensibilities and the inflamed imagination. It appeals to the soul by the most sublime motives that it is possible to conceive. It sets before us as matters of choice, life or death, blessing or cursing. It makes the will of God our rule. It places us under His omniscient eye; it points us to the august tribunal of an omnipotent judge, to an absolutely just and irrevocable sentence, which ends in the eternal bliss of the saved, or the interminable horrors of the damned. What more could possibly be done to move the will to wise and holy choice? It pleads with us, by the love of God, by the mercies of Christ, by the passion of the cross, by the blessedness of piety, and the miseries of sin, and the bliss of heaven, to choose eternal life.

(11) The Bible is perfectly adapted to man as a restraining power. Man is a complex being, a little world in himself,-an animal and an angel dwelling together. "Body and soul, reason and passion, conscience and desire, are often opposing and conflicting forces, and man is left

"In doubt to act or rest,
In doubt to deem himself a God or beast,
In doubt his soul or body to prefer."

"The intestine war of reason against the passions," says Paschal, "has given rise, among those who wish for peace, to the formation of two different sects. The one wished to renounce the passions and become as Gods; the other, to renounce reason and become as beasts."

Such a being needs guidance and restraint. The fiery steeds of passion must be put under bit and bridle, and be made to obey the dictates of right reason, instead of breaking away under the spur of desire. There is no natural and essential principle of our nature that needs to be, or can be, eradicated; but there are many that need to be subordinated and restrained. The abnormal and the depraved in them need to be removed by sanctifying grace. The Bible perfectly reveals this only way of harmonizing reason and conscience with the conflicting emotions and turbulent passions, and bringing them all into submission to the perfect will of God. It does not teach us to abuse and waste the body by torturing austerities; nor does it surrender us to the supremacy of wasting passions. It forbids everything that is malevolent and selfish and harmful; it permits whatever is benevolent, and calculated to enhance the good of man and the glory of God. It excludes from no

enjoyment that is compatible with the highest good. It demands no self-denial but that willing sacrifice of perfect love. It represses only evil, and that at its source, by removing depravity from the heart. If the Bible had its way and was perfectly obeyed, it would everywhere produce characters of great symmetry and loveliness. It would put an end to wicked self-seeking and carnal ambitions, settle all the ills of human society, and make this world a vestibule of heaven.

(12) This Bible, when permitted to control the life has redeemed uncounted millions of men. It has found men in the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity, slaves of appetites and passions, and made them freemen in Christ. It has transformed savage nations and cannibal tribes into civilized and God-fearing peoples. It has taken souls steeped in guilt, "having no hope and without God in the world," and made them the adopted sons and daughters of God. This is an argument from human experience that is unanswerable. Infidels may scoff and critics may deride; but faith in the Bible by those it has transformed, will remain unshaken. However dissected and set at nought, the Book will remain to them, their stay and hope and guide to heaven.

(13) This Bible is fitted for universal supremacy. It has the power to bring hope and help and healing to every son and daughter of Adam. It has never failed to bless any people in any age or clime. It is already translated in over eight hundred languages, and wherever it goes it carries "healing in its wings."

"There are certain great moral interests which are common to the race,-certain cords in the human heart," says Hopkins, "which vibrate whenever they are struck; and it is remarkable that Christianity concerns itself only with those interests, and strikes only those cords. It has to do with individuals as guilty under the government of God, without respect to their earthly relations; and hence has the power to enter in as a new element, and to pervade and enlighten every form of society, as the sunlight enters into and pervades the whole body of atmosphere." Hence it diffuses itself everywhere as freely as the breezes of heaven past every human or national limit. It works like leaven that passes on from particle to particle, and finds no limit till the whole is leavened. Thus the Bible is to push on in its conquests, until "the earth is full of the knowledge of God as the waters cover the sea."

(14) It has the right to be authoritative because of its blessed influence upon the world. It has never, when honestly and lovingly obeyed, led a soul astray. It has lifted mankind as no other book has ever done. It has pointed men to a Father in Heaven, and to the mansions He would prepare for all who will accept His grace. It has given us Jesus Christ as our ideal pattern of life, and given us a perfect morality springing from the law of love. It awoke the race from its slumbers of death, and infused it with the life of a new hope, which rose like a Sun of Righteousness upon an astonished world, and whose light shall never grow dim. It spoke to the mourners and they were comforted; it came to the weary and heavy laden, and gave them rest. It brought healing to the sick, and recovery of sight to the spiritually blind, and joy to the broken-hearted, and spiritual life to the sinsick and dying.

It caused the idol-gods to fall on their faces, and struck the heathen oracles dumb. It was a heaven-sent wind that swept away the poisonous malarial miasmas of heathenism, and let in the sunlight of truth, and the pure atmosphere of heaven. With its still small voice of holy influence it whispered

to souls who were planning iniquity and in love with secret sin, and somehow the spell was broken, and the spirit of wisdom came, and they repented and turned to God.

It uncovered the world of despair to men rushing on in their mad career of wickedness, and they fled with fear and trembling from the wrath to come. Through all the years, it has rebuked every iniquity, and encouraged everything that was lovely and of good report. It put the spirit of human pity and brotherly love into the hearts of cruel men, and they tore down their amphitheaters and stopped their gladiatorial shows, and struck the shackles from the limbs of slaves.

It has revolutionized religion, turning men from polytheism and pantheism and disgusting idolatry to the elevating worship of a holy God. It has turned human society upside down, and put a new spirit into the heart of our race wherever it has been circulated, and lovingly obeyed. It has honored man as man, regardless of his rank or condition, solely because he was a child of God and an heir of immortality. It has protected the life of infants, and lifted woman from degradation to respect and honor as the equal of man. It is lifting savage tribes and races to Christian civilization and moral decency. It is lessening the horrors of war, and the frequency of it by spreading the spirit of "peace and good will to men." Yea, the nations are now moving to end all wars, and serve together the Prince of peace. It has introduced the spirit of disinterested benevolence, till men pour out vast sums munificently upon the poor and the helpless, and even upon the vicious and the thankless, and the undeserving, whom they have never seen and never expect to see in this life, as Jesus came to give Himself to a needy world because it needed Him.

Now what we say is this; this Book stands in a class by itself, unapproached and unapproachable. Whether we consider its singular origin, written by more than two score authors through a space of fifteen hundred years, or its internal harmony, or its single purpose to bring a sinful and lost humanity back to God, or its pure morality, or its heavenly spirituality, or its plan of salvation, by faith in an Atoning Savior, or its saving and transforming power over an individual or a people, or its sublime revelations of the yet future destiny of our race,-the Bible comes to us, instinct with Divinity, bearing the impress of heaven.

If obeyed it will produce in us a perfect morality. It offers blessing to every part of our nature, entire sanctification for our body, as well as for our intellect, affections, imagination, conscience and will. It reveals to us all that is necessary to bring human nature to its highest perfection here, and to eternal glory hereafter. It heralds its own greatness and announces its own supremacy, and divine origin. It proves its own inspiration by what it is, and by what it has done. It could no more have been produced by unaided man, than the mountains, or the ocean, or the stars of heaven. Such a Book, with such a history, and such a divine power, has a right to speak with authority. It says to a sinsick, sorrowing humanity, "Obey and live; disobey and perish."

* * * * *

CHAPTER VII -- HIGHER CRITICISM

Queen Victoria is regarded by common consent as the greatest civil ruler of the Christian centuries. But she was more than a queen. She was a noble wife and mother. She walked the high

places of the earth in the white robes of unstained Christian womanhood. It is notorious that she elevated all the courts of Europe by her exalted Christian character.

Now would the many descendants of this great Queen, in a family council, select an author to write her biography who

1. Denied the legitimacy of her birth;
2. Questioned her right to reign;
3. Was bent on blackening her Christian character;
4. Was determined to break down her influence;
5. Was committed to lowering her standing in the estimation of the hundreds of millions over whom she graciously ruled? We repeat, would the royal family select such a biographer? It is simply unthinkable.

But our precious Bible is The Royal Book of all the ages. It has blessed the nations, as no other book that was ever penned. It has turned countless millions of sinners into the saints of God. It has inspired the races of men, and led the march of human progress. It is against sin, the curse of the world, and is in favor of holiness from cover to cover. In short, above all other books, it blesses the living and comforts the dying, and points the way for a fallen humanity from a sinned earth to a holy heaven.

But multitudes of Christian people are letting infidel Higher Critics write the biography of their Royal Book for them,-men who declare that it is a bastard begotten of forgery, and conceived by fraud; that it never did have any right to command the obedience of men; that it has no divine character of supernatural origin; that its claims are utter falsehoods; its history is a compilation of fables, and a tissue of lies;-men who do not, indeed, believe that there ever was, or can be, any specially Divine Book.

This may seem to be a severe arraignment of the Higher Critics; but we shall prove what we say of them.

We wish to say at the outset, that there is a conservative, reverent, devoutly spiritual higher criticism of the Holy Word, which seeks to know all the facts, and to preserve the Book free from every error, and send it out as the supernatural and inspired oracle of God to bless the world. The Bible is safe in such hands. Hengstenberg and Home are examples.

But there are Higher Critics whose avowed purpose is destructive; who study the Word with one fell object to destroy its influence, and bring it into discredit in the minds of men.

When men thus seek for whatever may destroy confidence in the integrity and credibility and truthfulness of the Bible; when their animus is like that of Jehoiakim, who cut with his penknife the

sacred roll and cast it into the fire, because his wicked heart did not like its contents, we should draw back from them, and be very slow to adopt their conclusions.

I. Let us consider the vile fountain from which this stream of Bible criticism has flowed.

1. Spinoza, the rationalist and pantheist Dutch philosopher, first impugned the received date and Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and ascribed it to Ezra, in 1670 A. D.

2. Hobbes, the famous English infidel, adopted the theory and, besides denying the Mosaic authorship, denied the necessity and possibility of any revelation.

3. Astruc, a profligate, free-thinker of France, in 1753, propounded for the first time, the Jehovistic and Elohistive divisive hypothesis, and opened a new era of criticism. He was the father of the documentary theories.

4. Eichhorn, born 1752, was the first rationalistic free-thinker to use the phrase "higher-criticism."

Professor Cheyne of Oxford informs us that what led Eichhorn to enter on his task was his hope to make the Bible popular with German rationalists, by reducing it to the level of a merely human book. It was to be done by eliminating out of it everything that was miraculous. We may remark that if the Bible is sufficiently criticised and degraded it might be made popular in the bottomless pit.

5. Reuss, Graf, Vatke, Kuenen, and Wellhausen and many others, we are informed, were all rationalists who practically ruled out the supernatural and the miraculous, "and believed in an evolution of a practically deistic kind." So writes Prof. J. J. Reeve who himself was once caught in the meshes of this dragnet of criticism.

These are the continental gods of this wave of modern infidelity that has swept over Christendom. The English and American destructive critics are simply weak reflections of these continental infidels. They are utterly destitute of, and quite ignore, the religious sense and spirit. They seem to be utterly lacking "a God-consciousness." As one noble scholar and writer says: "How far removed from the realms of a true higher criticism are such men as Kuenen, a professed polytheist, or Wellhausen, a confirmed deist, or Harnack, a scoffer of the divine Christ, or Cheyne, whose mind is so clouded with unbelief, that he can see nothing supernatural in the Bible, or in Christianity."

6. Moreover, the theory of evolution is the muddy pool from which they drink. They go to their work with a predetermination to alter or eliminate anything that stands in the way of driving this theory through the Bible. Their animus is shown by one of them lately, who said: "Our purpose is to reconstruct Bible History in harmony with the theory of evolution; to eliminate by this process all that is supernatural from the Bible record; and to unite scholars in support of sweeping changes in the orthodox view of the Holy Scriptures."

"A rational public sentiment should confront such a critic," says Professor Townsend, "and brand his animus as vicious, and his method as basely unscientific. The views of such men may well be debarred from the realms of respectable scholarship."

Another reviewer says: "As Vatke, made the hypothesis of evolution the guiding presupposition of his critical work, so today does Professor Jordan, the very latest representative of the higher criticism, say: "The nineteenth century has applied to the history of the Hebrew people its own magic word, evolution. The thought represented by that popular word, has been found to have a real meaning in our investigations regarding the religious life and the theological beliefs of Israel." So it would seem that their "assured results" so-called, have not been gained by scientific induction, but by twisting and dissecting the Bible pages, and rearranging them to make them conform to a preassumed hypothesis of evolution. The boasted "results" have no existence, therefore, save in the infidel critic's imagination.

To such men as Graf, Vatke, Kuenen, Harnack and Wellhausen, all nature and religious as well as secular history, are a product of forces within, and in process of development. There has not been, and could not be, any direct action of God upon man; there could be no break in the chain of cause and effect. Hence there can be no miracle, or anything of what is known as the supernatural. God is a prisoner in his own world, unable to do anything but in the way of ordinary processes. There could be no epoch-making revelation, no revivals, no declensions, no special exhibition of divine power, no incarnation, no redemption. They study the Bible through the glasses of this foregone conclusion, and the entire question is practically settled beforehand.

Manifestly, the Bible is in transparent disagreement with such a theory; therefore it must be rearranged, and dissected, and expurgated, and divided, and eliminated, until what is left may seem to them to be in harmony with their precious evolution theory. These impious, vandal hands treat the Holy Book with no more regard or reverence than might be accorded to a last year's almanac advertising a quack nostrum. We could say much more about this vile fountain of infidel criticism; what wonder that the stream has been so pernicious and so vile!

It would seem to a calm and reasonable mind to be enough for the Higher Critics to degrade the Bible into a book of myths and fictions, forgeries and folklore tales. It would seem as if they would be satisfied to deny the inspired and the miraculous and the ancient in the Holy Word; to question the existence of Abraham and Moses; to deny that the Pentateuch is authentic; that the Children of Israel ever were in Egypt; that if there ever was a Moses, it matters little, for he never wrote anything; neither did David write any Psalms; and there was a whole school of Isaiahs, living in several different centuries. Such a wholesale destruction of a literature that was the light of the world for above a thousand years ought to appease the destructive tendencies of almost any perverted mind.

But not so. The less they can leave of the Bible that is not discredited and destroyed, the better these infidel theological professors are satisfied. So they march over into the New Testament for a new world to conquer. To their vandal hands, nothing is sacred. It was not enough to reject the Gospel of John as so much rubbish, and to discredit the other Gospels as wholly unreliable, and to degrade the Savior of the world into a mere man, of good character indeed, and somewhat clever, but only the bastard son of a fallen Jewish maiden, quite fanatical and partially insane. Even all

this does not fill up the measure of their carnal audacity, and their low craving for notoriety, and their depraved ambition to lead all others in a malign assault upon the Christian faith. Their dislike of all bonds, and all allegiance to the blessed Son of God, and all the claims of gratitude and devotion made by Him who bought them with His blood, reveals itself in a still more daring assault of their infidelity.

Two German critics, Professor Zimmern, and Professor Jensen of Marburg, now actually advance the daring theory that no such person as Jesus Christ ever existed, Christ is essentially a Jewish version of the Babylonian Gilgamesh Epos. "Practically all of the Gospel narrative is purely legendary, and there is no reason at all to consider anything that is told of Jesus as historical. The Jesus legend is an Israelitish Gilgamesh legend." In his concluding chapter of a book of a thousand pages, Professor Jensen writes: "Jesus of Nazareth, in whom, as in the Son of God, and the Saviour of the world, Christianity has believed for nearly two thousand years, and who is regarded, even by the most advanced scholarship of our own day, as a good and great man who lived and died, the sublime pattern of the ideal, ethical life-this Jesus has never lived upon earth; neither has he died, because he is nothing but an Israelitish Gilgamesh (a hero of fiction). We, the children of a much-lauded time of progress and achievements, we who look down upon the superstitions of the past with a forbearing smile, we worship in our cathedrals and churches, in our meetinghouses and schools, in palaces and shanties, a Babylonian deity!"

And so this audacious German infidel while teaching in a Christian (?) institution, looks Christianity in the face, and tells us that the scholars of nineteen Christian centuries have, in their childish simplicity, worshipped Christ Jesus, as a real being-the God-man who lived upon this earth, and died for our redemption, and rose from the dead and ascended to the right hand of God to intercede for our salvation, when, lo! he is only a creation of fiction,- a literary invention, an imaginary character borrowed from Babylon, that never had an existence save in an author's mind! Was there ever such modesty as is incarnated in this German professor's breast! But what a pity that he did not come upon the stage of action, long centuries before! How he might have undeceived the deluded, uncounted millions of the Christian centuries, who have poured their precious ointments on the head of this fictitious Christ, and laid their priceless treasures at His imaginary feet! What countless prayers might have been saved! What sorrowful confessions from contrite hearts might have remained unspoken! What solemn vows of devotion might never have been made, and what deathless love for this unreal being would never have been called out!

But, laying jest aside, was there ever a bigger fool than an impractical German professor can make of himself, or moral madness greater than he can show, when his unrestrained infidelity and carnal conceit display themselves in the field of Higher Criticism? If there is, it must be the Englishman, or the American who tries to ape him, and says "me too," to all his folly. The theory impeaches the intellectual and moral sanity of the Christian ages.

When I was in England the last time, I received from the author, a book "Has Jesus Ever Lived?" with a letter. It was filled up with the same infidel screed copied from the two German infidels last named. Not an original thought in the book! The poor man could not write his letter, or copyright his book, or make a legal contract, or write a bank check, or register a deed to a piece of property, anywhere in the civilized world, without dating it from the birth of that despised Jesus

Christ, who he thought had never lived! What a silly fool the man made of himself, aping German infidelity!

II. Consider its underlying purpose.

The men who have been most distinguished as the leaders of the higher critical movement in Germany and Holland, have been men who have had no faith in the God of the Bible, and no faith in either the necessity or the possibility of a personal, supernatural revelation. So their system of criticism has been based on hypothesis and supposition which have for their object the destruction of the traditional view of the Bible. The method and tone and animus of their writings show that they have studied and written with that predetermination not to confirm the credibility and authority of the Scriptures, but to discredit their genuineness, and destroy all confidence in the Holy Word.

Professor Townsend, of Boston University quotes Professor Kruger, as saying with brutal frankness: "It is the calling of the theological professor not only intentionally to shake their hearers in their naive faith, but to lead them into doubt, even though there are those who, on this dangerous way, are lost; hence it is our task to endanger souls." An imp of hell is as fit to fill a chair in a theological seminary as a man capable of writing so diabolical a sentence. It arouses the righteous indignation of every truly Christian soul.

Dr. E. B. Pusey, Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford, "who in a book recently published, has completely demolished the theories of Professors Driver and Cheyne as to the Maccabean origin of the Book of Daniel," says: "The criticism of Rationalism is but a flimsy veil which hides from no eyes but its own (if indeed it does that) the real ground of its rebellion, which is the repugnance to receive a revelation from God to which it must submit." Being a professor in the same university with these critics he probably knows what he is talking about. At any rate the carnal heart and the cloven hoof are plainly manifest in their writings.

Dr. Emil Reich, in "The Failure of Higher Criticism," with the distinguished Dean of Canterbury in the chair, said: "What is called Higher Criticism is one of the greatest crimes of modern times; its essential position implies that the Bible is a stupendous fraud."

It is painful to be obliged to write such things about these men. But their persistent adherence to discredited opinions; their determined pushing of unproved hypotheses, known to be destructive to the blessed Book, coupled with a contemptuous ignoring of all opposing facts, gives conclusive evidence of special pleading, that is unscientific, dishonorable, and determinedly hostile to the Holy Word.

III. Their Methods and Riding Hypotheses.

Matthew Arnold is quoted as saying: "If you shut a number of men up to make study and learning the business of their lives, how many of them, from want of some discipline or other, seem to lose all balance of judgment, ALL COMMON SENSE." Canon Dyson Hague, M. A., of Toronto, Canada, says: "It is notorious that some of the most learned German thinkers are men who lack, in a singular degree, the faculty of common sense, and knowledge of human nature. For hypothesis weaving and speculation, the German theological professor is unsurpassed, and it is amazing to

what length the German fancy can go in the direction of the subjective and the conjectural." One of the foremost thinkers used to lay it down as a fundamental truth in philosophical and scientific inquiries that no regard whatever should be paid to the conjectures or hypotheses of thinkers, and quoted as an axiom the great Newton, and his famous words: "Non fingo hypotheses" (I do not frame hypotheses).

But with these higher critics their hypotheses are the chief stock in trade. In their discussions, the most sacred truth, or the most solemn utterance of God Almighty is not half so important as their own hypothesis. "It is absolute, and dominates every attempt to understand the record, shapes every conclusion, arranges and rearranges the facts in its own order, discards what does not fit, or reshapes it to make it fit." The critics may deny this; but their treatment of the Old Testament is too well known to need any proof of it. The use of the Redactor is a case in point. This purely imaginary being, unhistorical and unscientific, is brought into requisition at almost every difficulty. It is acknowledged that at times he acts in a manner wholly inexplicable. To assume such a person interpolating names of God, changing names, and making explanations to suit the purpose of their hypotheses and imagination, is the very negation of science, notwithstanding their boast of a scientific method. Their minds seem to be in abject slavery to their theory. No reason is more impervious to facts than one preoccupied with a theory which does not agree with facts. They give more credence to the guesses of some so-called scholar, than to the teaching of Scripture, supported by any amount of archaeological evidence. They feel instinctively that to accept the Bible statement would be the ruin of their hypothesis, because the two are absolutely irreconcilable. As their theory must not be interfered with, the Bible is coolly set aside as a forgery, or a collection of unhistoric myths."

But we must be more specific about these critical methods, and state definitely their hypotheses. They may be stated thus:

1. They deny miracles and reject the truthfulness of any miraculous narrative. What we Christians consider to be miraculous, they say are only "legendary exaggerations of events that are entirely explicable from natural causes."
2. They deny the reality of prophecy and the validity of any prophetic statement. What Christians, and Christ and the Apostles, have called prophecies, they call dexterous conjectures, coincidences, fiction, or imposture; or an account written after the event, and skilfully projected back, into the past as a prophecy. Otherwise a prophecy would be a miracle, and they deny the possibility of a miracle.
3. They deny the reality of inspiration. Men who wrote the Bible were no more inspired of God than any other clever writers of any age or race.
4. They deny the reality of revelation in the sense in which it has ever been held by the Christian Church, from the Apostles' time until now. They, the German leaders, have been avowed unbelievers of the supernatural. They have gone on the assumption of the falsity of the Scriptures, and utterly scouted their claim to be the Word of God. Spinoza repudiated utterly a supernatural revelation. Eichhorn discarded the miraculous, and declared that everything supernatural was an oriental exaggeration. De Wettes' views as to inspiration were entirely infidel. Vatke and Leopold

George were Hegelian rationalists, and regarded the first four books of the Old Testament as entirely mythical. Kuenen wrote in the interest of an avowed Naturalism. He was a free-thinking agnostic who did not believe in the Revelation of the one true and living God. The utterances of the prophets were all their own. Wellhausen held that the religion of Israel did not come from God, but was a naturalistic evolution from heathendom, an emanation from an imperfectly monotheistic kind of semi-pagan idolatry. It was simply a human religion, like all the others of the world.

Such are the ruling principles of these leaders, as given by Canon Dyson Hague in his History of the Higher Criticism. They were simply infidels, like all other literary infidels, writing to break down the Bible, and undermine its influence over men. Their unbelief was the parent and antecedent, and not the consequent, of their criticism.

5. Notice their criticism and methods.

(1) Because in Gen. 1:1 to 2:3 the Hebrew word for God, Elohim is used, and in Gen. 2:4 to 3: 24, God is usually Jehovah Elokim, and in chapter 4 He is called Jehovah, and in chapter 5, He is called Elohim, and in chapter 6: 1-8, He is Jehovah, and in the rest of chapter 6, He is Elohim, a French infidel profligate suggests that Genesis was compiled of two previously existing documents, the Elohim document called Elohim, and a Jehovah document called Jehovah.

(2) To get rid of Moses and the truthfulness of the Bible history and make room for evolution, they say that Elohim was written about 800 B. C., that is 650 years after Moses died; then fifty or a hundred years afterward Jehovah was written. Others say, for these all-knowing higher critics never agree, that Jehovah was written first, and Elohim was written fifty or a hundred years later.. But,

(3) The fourteenth chapter of Genesis is utterly impossible and nothing but a literary invention. There were no such kings as Amraphel and Chedorlaomer, and Arioch and Tidal making war upon the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah. The critics say, "The story must be pure myth or fiction," since there was no record of Babylonian expeditions into Palestine in the patriarchal age. But, as we shall see, it has all proved to be not fiction, but sober fact. The very names of these kings have been resurrected from the dead past by the spade of the archaeologist. It was only the infidel critics who were mistaken and not the writer of Genesis.

(4) But this dividing of Genesis made such a sensation for the critics that they became elated and went on with the rest of the Bible. The Jehovah and Elohim documents were fused together into Jehovah Elohim by another unknown somebody, called a Redactor, by the critics.

(5) But some later critics, Vater Hartmann and others divided Elohim into several Elohim and Jehovah into several Jehovahs and gave us the Fragment Hypothesis which is "the Document Hypothesis run mad."

(6) Then some other unknown nobody wrote Deuteronomy, about 621 B. C. and palmed it off on King Josiah and the people of his day, and started them to keeping a code of hitherto unheard of laws,-the most unlikely story that could be invented. This last book is called by the critics, Deuteronomy.

(7) Then another Redactor No. 2, combined Jehovah and Elohim and Deuteronomy, and added an introduction and an appendix. Who he was, or what he did it for, not even the all-knowing infidel critics can tell.

(8) Then some other unknown nobodies began to put the priestly laws into writing. Their various efforts were put together by Ezra, about 444 B. C. This production is called P and this was redacted by a final redactor about 280 B. C. They must place the laws very late, because nobody knew enough to make such laws in the time of Moses. But here is a most unaccountable difficulty with this theory, (a) The critics tell us that there probably never was a Moses; and if there ever was such a person, he never wrote anything anyway. But (b) the author of Deuteronomy, and Ezra, the author of the priestly code in Leviticus, wrote their books to bless the nation; and (c) by pious brand and literary forgery they projected them back into the past a thousand years, and attached them to that unknown and obscure but influential Moses, to make them pass with the people!!! No wonder thoughtful people think these critics lack common sense.

(9) After Jehovah, Deuteronomy, Elohim and P have been properly redacted into Jehovah Elohim Deuteronomy, by R2, then Joshua is written a thousand or so years after the old warrior went to glory.

(10) Every little while "Elohim" appears in the wrong place, and the critics are compelled to introduce another unscrupulous redactor. Someone must be invented who took liberties with the documents. Then "Jehovah" will appear out of place, and another rascally redactor must be invented by the critics to save their hypothesis. Let heaven and earth pass away, and the elements dissolve with fervent heat; but by all means save the hypothesis of these infidel critics, for it is the only sacred thing left in this corner of the universe! So with every misplaced name of Deity, and every miracle and everything supernatural, and every historical fact that annihilates their theory, they fortify themselves by inventing a fresh batch of redactors who "must have interpolated" some wrong name of God, or a fiction about a miracle, or a story about an impossible event, while they were redacting the redactions of preceding redactors! "Hence new divisions, and the gradual resolution of the original Jehovah Elohim into the nebulous series Jehovah 1, Jehovah 2, Jehovah 3; Elohim 1, Elohim 2, Elohim 3; P1, P2, P3, P4; R1, R2, R3; and they have added Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4, Q5; all of which have now become part of the recognized apparatus of the critical schools" (Dr. Orr). To any one who has the sense of humor left in him, the intellectual and literary performances of these critics is becoming more supremely ridiculous than the roaring farce of a cheap theater. Some of the American shadows of the European critics modestly calculate that there were ten or twelve writers in the Hexateuch. But Kuenen thinks there were eighteen. Wellhausen thinks there were twenty-two. And Driver, not to be outdone by anybody in this exhibition of folly, ambitiously "divides Joshua alone into ninety different pieces, no two consecutive pieces being by the same author. It is hard to say how many hands were engaged in putting together this simple story." W. Robertson Nichol, D. D., LL. D., says of this complicated but confidently maintained scheme, "It is just too complete, too wonderfully finished, too clever by half! Any other book of such vast antiquity could be put through a modern mincing machine (of higher criticism) and produce a similar result."

What wonder that a writer in *Christliche Welt* expresses strong fears that the "whole theological structure" reared by "the advanced clans," of criticism, "will fall in pieces like a house built of cards?" And Professor Adolf Juelicher, of Marburg, himself a critic, castigates his brethren in scathing terms, ridiculing their "arrogance, pretense of knowledge, and rejection of longrecorded history"; their "enormous traffic in hypotheses"; their "mania for piling up details in support of preconceived and revolutionary theories." He taunts them with "explaining away historical personages," describes their science as "a disease," and says "they are becoming weaker and weaker through the whole field of rhetorical research."

(11) The story of the tabernacle must be destroyed. For if it remains it will prove that a priestly code, and moral and spiritual laws, and a completed system of sacrificial worship existed in the time of Moses; and it would be of divine origin and not a human evolution. But that would be fatal to their hypothesis of evolution, and their whole fabric of criticism would go down. The tabernacle was built under the direction of God, by Moses, at Sinai. Thirteen chapters of Exodus are devoted to a minute description of the plan and construction of the building. Then the book of Leviticus and ten chapters of Numbers tell us how it was to be set up, and how it was to be taken down, and who were to carry it, and all of itsj utensils, when the people journeyed from place to place, and how the sacrifices were to be offered. For five hundred years it was a very conspicuous object in ancient Israelitish history. In the New Testament the Epistle to the Hebrews is devoted to explaining from a Christian point of view the typology and religious significance of that old building.

It is mentioned also in other books of the Bible. Joshua and Samuel, and Chronicles, and Kings and Jeremiah and Psalms. Collateral testimony comes from Josephus, and from Archeology. The very spot where it stood at Shiloh for more than three hundred years has been discovered.

But behold the method of these critics. No matter with what evidence anything in Scripture is supported; if it stands in the way of their hypothesis, it must be got rid of at any cost.

With absolute unscrupulousness, and unbounded and most presumptuous audacity, they deny the very existence of the tabernacle. The whole story of it in the Bible is a fiction dexterously woven into book after book of the Old Testament. In other words it is a wicked literary forgery of Ezra or some of his priestly friends after the exile, to help in the introduction of a new temple ritual at Jerusalem. In this way not only the Pentateuch but the whole historic Bible is to be destroyed and made a disjointed patchwork of fiction, and myths and fraud and forgery!

The reason of it all is that it would never do for the critics to admit that away back in the Mosaic times the Tabernacle, with all its elaborate ritual, and with the lofty moral and spiritual ideas embodied in it, could have existed; because that would be equivalent to admitting the falsity of their whole doctrine. With the unblushing effrontery of all other infidels, they would rather make the world believe that the Bible speaks falsely, and is an utterly untrustworthy book. The excuses that the critics make for their views are simply frivolous.

1. They say that the Bible account of the construction is unrealistic or impractical;

2. That the tabernacle was altogether too costly, highly artistic, and ponderous an affair, to have been produced by the Israelites at Mt. Sinai, and afterward carried by them all through the wilderness.

3. These people in the desert, and at Mt. Sinai, they say, were "mere wandering Bedouins" having but little civilization, and were "poor even to beggary," and they possessed neither the means nor the intellectual capability necessary for the construction and transportation of the Tabernacle.

The answer to all this is plain to a novice.

(a) They had jewels and gold in abundance, for when they left Egypt "they spoiled the Egyptians."

(b) There were precious stones and mines of copper in that very country and the sbitim-wood or Acacia grew in abundance at Sinai out of which the boards and pillars and poles of the Tabernacle were constructed.

(c) These Hebrews were born and had always lived in Egypt, the most advanced nation in the world in arts and architecture, palaces and temples, pyramids and obelisks, and carved statues and columns. These Hebrews were the working classes, the very people who would have the mechanical skill, and handicraft-wisdom of their age. Professor Sayce affirms that, regarded, as an invention, the Tabernacle story is "too elaborate, too detailed to be conceivable." It must be true. The infidel critics will go down in disgrace before the indubitable facts. See Professor Heagle's "Tabernacle in the Wilderness."

(12) The prophetic element in the Bible must be disposed of, as it militates against the rationalistic infidelity of these critics. So, for an example, Isaiah must be divided. The prophecies in the last twenty-seven chapters were too remarkable to let pass. Therefore, the critics say, "there must have been" a deuterio Isaiah who wrote the latter part of the book at the close of the exile, after the events occurred. To be sure, there is no intimation in any quarter that any such prophet lived at that time, to whom these chapters might be ascribed, or that they were, in fact, ever attributed by anyone in ancient times to any other than Isaiah, the Son of Amoz. But that does not make the slightest difference to an infidel when he has once imagined an hypothesis with which to attack the Bible.

Then they began to increase the number of Isaiahs. They fairly spawned them, till, Cheyne, bidding higher than anybody else for the crown of folly and future infamy, "is said to have taken great pains to tear the book of Isaiah's prophecies into one hundred and sixty pieces, all by unknown writers; which pieces were scattered through ten different epochs including four and a half centuries!" Such a literary conclusion is modesty itself!

(13) The whole order of national thought and literary development must be rearranged to be adjusted to their theory of evolution. So these infidels set at nought all that the Bible authors say about themselves, and about each other, and all that God's people have believed about them for nearly three thousand years. "The laws in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, are so intimately blended with the history as to be inseparable. Whoever wrote the one must have written the other likewise. And Genesis is plainly conceived and written as introductory to the Mosaic history and

legislation. One consistent topic and method of treatment is pursued through the Pentateuch; the genealogies are continuous and mutually supplementary; a consistent chronology is maintained; there are implications and allusions in one portion to what is found in other portions by way of anticipation or reminiscence which bind all together."

"There are Psalms in which all the events of the exodus and the history of Israel as far as the first king, are recalled. What rational principle allows their composition to be assigned to a period eight or nine centuries farther on? Then there are numerous Psalms in which royalty plays an elevated and prevailing part. Could these have been written centuries after the kings had disappeared; in the very centuries when it is supposed the Jews were given to satire against kings?" So asks Schmauk. And it is a most pertinent question in view of the fact that the critics have decided that the Pentateuch was composed about one thousand years after Moses, and the Psalms were written some two hundred years before Christ, as "the war-songs of the Maccabees."

Now this theory is against nature, and contrary to the order of development of literature in every great nation of history. "It was not the case with the literatures of Egypt, of Assyria, of Rome, of Greece, of Germany, or of England." "It makes," says Schmauk, "all Israel's literature spring from the period of the nation's decline and fall. It leaves the basal and institutional epochs of Israel's early strength, and the balmy and propitious periods of her maturer prime without a literature. It assigns her grandest writings to the age of Ezra and later, and places all her productive powers, after her national decay."

The great men who have stamped the world with their abiding influence - Moses, Joshua, Samuel, Nathan, David, Solomon, - wrote nothing and the greater part of what is assigned to them and to Isaiah and Jeremiah, was not written by these men at all, but by unknown scribes, obscure men, who made no mark on their own generation, and left no name to the generation that followed. Oftentimes some obscure man has done great work; but when we are called upon to believe that throughout a nation's entire history, the great men have done substantially nothing, and the nobodies have done everything, that is beyond the bounds of ordinary credibility." The improbability that this matchless literature, the most influential and beneficent this world has ever had, was produced by writers, no one of whom was ever heard of, is well-nigh infinite,

(14) These critics have built up their destructive theories on "words," and "sentences," "literary style," and their own "subjective sense" of who "must have written" this or that, or who "could not have written" this or that passage or verse. They call it "internal evidence." Thus they try to make the Bible destroy itself. Now this is sufficient to condemn their whole work. "Circumstantial evidence," says Schmauk, "is captivating as a rule in its plausibility, and striking to the human imagination; but a long experience has taught the judicial tribunals of the race, that circumstantial evidence is an unsafe thing by which to effect a proof. It is a valuable and clinching confirmation of positive proof. In the absence of the latter it is not entirely safe and trustworthy. There is especial need for caution when it is used to overthrow beliefs that have been generally held by humanity for ages and ages." Again he says, "The whole theory is dependent entirely upon internal evidence." But internal evidence is a very dangerous and flimsy thing on which to entirely rest a new theory. The difficulties in the case are so great that there are many presumptions against it, to one in its favor.

"Literary tact," says Professor Sayce of Oxford, "is but another name for a purely subjective impression; and the subjective impressions of a modern European in regard to ancient Oriental history are not likely to be of value... Of recent years, however, criticism has endeavored to bolster up the weakness of the philological method by an appeal to the doctrine of evolution. But here again, as in the case of "literary tact," the appeal is to subjective impressions and beliefs rather than to scientifically established facts... All theories about the evolution of ideas, whether religious or otherwise, are absolutely valueless. There is no single line of growth along which they must necessarily have moved, and, apart from the archaeological evidence, we can no more say that a particular phase of faith or thought has been evolved out of another than, apart from physiology, we can say that a particular form of life has a special ancestry.

"In both England and France books have been published of late years which we know to have been the joint work of more than one writer. The novels of Besant and Rice, and of Erkmann and Chatrion are familiar instances in point. They are written in languages which are both living, which embrace vast literatures, and with which we are thoroughly acquainted. And yet there is no Englishman who would undertake to say where Besant ends and Rice begins in the novels which they wrote together; and no Frenchman who would venture to do so in the case of the two French novelists.

How then is it possible for the European scholar of today to analyze an old Hebrew book into its component parts, to lay down with accuracy what section of the same verse belongs to one writer, what to a second, and what to a third, and even to fix the relative dates of these hypothetical authors?...

It follows from all this that the "critical" method is scientifically unsound, and its results will not stand the application of a scientific test. It is quite as much an artificial creation as was the Ptolemaic system of the universe, and like the latter requires for its support an ever-increasing number of fresh hypotheses and complicated qualifications. The varying dates assigned to these hypothetical authors of the Pentateuch, the successive strata of religious belief and custom supposed to be discoverable in it, the denial of the historical character of the narratives it contains, must all alike go with the foundation of sand upon which they have been built. An edifice reared on the subjective angles and assumptions of the modern European scholar is necessarily a house of cards."

On this same point, Professor Matthew Leitch of Belfast, says: "To divide a book into two or three parts, and assign each to a separate author, judging solely by internal evidence, might be possible in certain circumstances; but it is very difficult. Shakespeare in some of his plays, has worked up the writings of older dramatists, and it is very difficult to decide what is Shakespeare's own, and what is taken from others. No one is able to do it with any certainty, unless he has some external evidence to guide him, and no one would attempt it, judging merely by style and phraseology, if he has only brief scraps, and extracts of the writing used. Yet here are critics who can judge of the style and phraseology of a single verse, or half-verse, and assign it with confidence to an author of whom they know little or nothing. They can tell not only what parts of lost documents were adopted by the compiler, but what passed over. They can split up a small book like the Pentateuch into fragments and assign them to above a score of authors." That this book, which has proved its literary unity and powerful individuality by winning its way to the hearts of young and old for a

hundred generations, is an artificial combination of scraps of literature, patched together by a score of unknown compilers, is a theory big with absurdity. It proves more than anything else, the unbounded conceit of the critics.

(15) These infidel critics assume that any writer only has one style, and any composition not in that peculiar style cannot be his. Nothing could be more absolutely fallacious. Such an assumption allows a Bible writer no spontaneity or versatility in style. If he diverges a hair's breadth from what the critic considers to be his style, a redactor is at once brought in to account for the divergency.

Some authors have shown a surprising diversity, in their style of writing. How would the critics get along with John Milton's *L' allegro*, and *Paradise Lost*, and *Areopagitica*, and Latin poems, and Italian sonnets, and *Comus*? What about Gladstone's speeches in parliament and his writings about the Greek Classics, and "The Impregnable Rock of Scripture?" What would the same kind of critics say two thousand years from now about the earlier and later style of Thomas Carlyle, or about the "indescribable mixture of the sublime and grotesque, tragic pathos and riotous humor" of "Sartor Resartus"; or the "fierce sardonic, furious," *Latter-Day Pamphlets*, and his "calm and tender" *Life of Sterling*? They would solemnly tell the world that "all scholars are agreed" that one dozen authors had made the books attributed to Carlyle. And if the twenty or more publications of our own Bayard Taylor should be preserved so long, and should be examined by a board of Higher Critics in the year 4000 A. D. they would be so bewildered by his travels, translations, novels, ballads, pastorals, lyrics, songs and odes, that they would solemnly declare, "all scholars are united" in the belief that the "Isaiah family" is outnumbered by the "Bayard Taylor family," and "it is admitted" that the works of at least one hundred authors, writing through several centuries, have come down to us under the common name of "Bayard Taylor"! Of the correctness of this opinion there can now be "no possible doubt"! Wonderful, all-knowing, infallible critics!

(16) Another standing method of these critics is to display an assumption of infallibility in their statements and claims, which is evidently intended to make an impression upon young and untrained minds. Canon Dyson Hague, M. A., of Toronto, says this even of George Adam Smith and Driver; much more is it true of Cheyne, Kuenen, Wellhausen and their like. To quote: "With a kind of *sic volo sic jubeo* airy ease he (Driver) introduces assertions and propositions that would really require chapter after chapter, if not even volume after volume, to substantiate. On page after page his 'must be,' and 'could not possibly be,' and 'could certainly not,' extort from the average reader the natural exclamation: 'But why?' 'Why not?' 'Wherefore?' 'On what grounds?' 'For what reason?' 'Where are the proofs?' But of proof or reason there is not a trace. The reader must be content with the writer's assertions. It reminds one, in fact, of the 'we may well suppose,' and 'per-haps' of the Darwinian who offers as the sole proof of the origination of a different species his random supposition!" (*Modern Ideas of Evolution*, Dawson, pp. 53-55).

This is simply a planned and deliberate method of these men to make an impression on unreflecting minds when they have neither facts nor argument; for they know too much not to know better!

(17) Another favorite method quite akin to this is their haughty and contemptuous treatment of every fact, and every sacred belief, and every irrefutable evidence that conflicts with their hypothesis, begotten of their rationalism and carnality. As one defender of the faith says, "It has

grown to be 'color-blindness and critical insanity! " Another learned theological professor, who once accepted their views, says, "Their onesided intellectualism, biased against Biblical Christianity, is responsible for a vast amount of intellectual pride, an aristocracy of intellect, with all the snobbery that accompanies that term. . . . Under the spell of this sublime contempt, they think they can ignore anything that does not square with their evolutionary hypothesis. Supremely satisfied with themselves and their self-constituted authority, they feel perfectly competent to criticize the Bible, the thinking of all the centuries, and even Jesus Christ himself!" Another oriental scholar, and author of a critical Bible dictionary, pronounces their kind and method of Biblical criticism to be "a species of moral insanity."

When a theory to which they have steadfastly adhered for a half century is hopelessly and forever shattered by an archaeological discovery, they ignore it and affect scorn for it, and go on with their mad folly. Such conduct is unscholarly, unscientific, and is downright, diabolical dishonesty. What Christian scholars demand is an honest, thorough, critical examination of the Bible; but they are opposed to the Biblical criticism of rationalists and unbelievers, whose judgment is biased by a foregone conclusion and warped by a heart hostile to truth. Such criticism "characterized by the most arbitrary conclusions drawn from the most spurious assumptions," has no claim to the respect of thoughtful men.

(18) Another method of this school of thinkers is both to covertly assume and openly boast that all scholars are in agreement with them, and that there is no scholarship on the other side. This arrogant boast would be only amusing, were it not so misleading and harmful to young men, who do not know the facts, and are anxious to be "up-to-date" in opinions and thought. But the truth is, the monstrous conceit of this claim is only equalled by its atrocious mendacity. It would be impossible to name the scholars among us who are opposed to these infidel critics, and are quite the peers in scholarship of any of them, because the list is so extended. We gather, however, some interesting facts here and there which throw light on this question of scholarship. While the faculties of many Congregational, Baptist and Methodist schools are divided, we read, that here in the United States the Baptist Theological School at Waco, Texas, and Louisville, Ky., are a unit against the New Theology. So are all the Lutheran Theological Schools of our country, the third largest Christian denomination in the land. They declared; in a General Synod at Pittsburgh some five years ago: "We thank God there is no Higher Criticism among us." All the faculties of ; the Christian Disciples, the fourth largest Protestant denomination in the United States, are free from this infection. The German seminaries at Dubuque, Iowa, and Berea, Ohio, the school of the United Brethren at Dayton, Ohio, the Cumberland Presbyterian School at Lebanon, Tenn., the Dutch Reformed School at New Brunswick, N. J., the United Presbyterian Seminaries at Pittsburgh, Pa., and at Xenia, Ohio, are each opposed to Higher Criticism; not a member of either of their faculties advocating it. In the Presbyterian Seminaries located at Allegheny, Pa., Cincinnati, Ohio, Omaha, Neb., at Columbia, S. C., at Richmond, Va., at Louisville, Ky., and San Jose, Calif., the faculties are all of one mind and one voice against the New Theology; "and the school at Princeton, N. J., which easily outranks all other theological schools on the continent, every member of the large faculty being a scholar of the highest standing, is uncompromisingly opposed to the new theology." This denomination is being rewarded for its loyalty to ; the faith by leading all others in America in effective evangelism and in accessions by profession of faith. Of course in these mutable times, these facts may not remain permanent about all those faculties. But they prove abundantly the absolute falsity of the claim ; that there is no modern scholarship defending the Bible.

Here are more than twenty Theological Seminaries all the members of whose faculties utterly reject Higher Criticism-a hundred scholars.

Then there are the late Dr. Samuel Curtiss of Chicago Theological Seminary, Professor G. Frederick Wright, D. D., LL. D., of Oberlin, known around the world and equal to the highest in authority, and Professor A. T. Clay of the University of Pennsylvania, author of "Babylonian Testimony to the Bible," and Professor Edmund G. Wolf, of Gettysburg Theological Seminary, and President G. W. McGarvey, of Lexington, Ky., author of "Should Isaiah Be Sawn Asunder?" and Rabbi Solomon Schechter, president of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, who has written in defense of the Bible, and Dr. Melvin Grove, of Frankford, Pa., the leading Egyptologist of America, author of four books defending the old Bible, and Professor Lampe, who punctured the bladder on which Dr. Briggs was floating, and Professor Howard Osgood of Rochester Theological Seminary,-a rare Hebrew scholar, who wrote "Exploded Theories Revived," and Dr. Edward Cone Bissell, professor of Hebrew in Hartford Theological Seminary, author of "Historic Origin of the Bible," and "The Pentateuch, Its Origin and Structure" and "Bible Antiquities," and Dr. John D. Davis, Professor of Oriental Literature of Princeton, and Dr. Robert Dick Wilson, of Princeton, and the late Dr. William Henry Green, chairman of the Old Testament Revision Committee, author of "Unity of the Book of Genesis," and "Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch," and Dr. Robert Cameron. Dr. Theodore E. Schmauk, editor of "The Lutheran Review" and author of "The Higher Criticism," and Daniel S. Gregory, editor of "Bible Student and Teacher." Dr. J. B. Thomas of Newton Theological Seminary, and Dr. Francis L. Patton of Princeton Seminary, and Dr. Willis G. Beecher of Auburn Theological Seminary, and a defender of the faith, and Franklin Johnson, D. D., LL. D., author of "Fallacies of Higher Criticism," and Professor J. J. Reeve, of Southwestern Theological Seminary, and Professor David Heagle, Ph. D., D. D., Ewing College, and Principal Wm. Caven, D. D., LL. D., of Toronto, Canada, and Canon Dyson Hague, M. A., of London, Ontario. Here are twenty-five more men, honored in the world of scholarship and authorship, to which list might be added the worthy names of Dr. Daniel Steele and Professor L. T. Townsend, D. D., S. T. D., of Boston University and Professor Geo. P. Fisher, D. D., LL. D., of Yale. Talk about the schools and the scholars of America all being on the side of the New Theology. A ranker piece of misrepresentation than that never has been perpetrated upon an innocent and unsuspecting public."

I quote from Professor Townsend's "New Theology Only Bubbles" much of the above list of scholars, and also the following about the scholars of Europe. "Dr. Klostermann of Kiel; Dr. Hoffman, of Berlin; Dr. Fritz Hommel, Professor of Semitic Languages, University of Munich; Dr. H. H. Kuyper, Dr. Bavinck, and Dr. Rutgers of Amsterdam. Dr. Koberle of Eclangen, Professor C. Von Orelli of Basle; Professor Kettle, of Leipzig, and Professor Edward Konig; Dr. Alfred Jeremias of Leipsic; Dr. Dornstetter; Dr. E. Sellin, of University of Louvain; Professor Kautsch of Galle; Professor Earth of Berne; Professor Von G. Hoberg of Freiburg; Professor John Kunz, of Leipsic; Professor F. Bettex, D. D., of Stuttgart, Germany and Professor Holtaman of Berlin, who declares that "Higher Criticism has already run its round in Germany," and Professor Ruprecht, who after making a survey of American, English and German theology, declares, "The number of those who are taking the conservative view of Bible Criticism is constantly on the increase." The cry now is "Back to tradition." "Back to Christ and His Testimony!" What a pity it is that our American Theological Students, for the last quarter of a century had been so fast to finish their

studies by going to Germany and loading up on rationalism and infidel criticism! "Professor Wellhausen's day is already over. Some ten years ago a visitor to his class-room in Gottengen University, found him lecturing to one student, and that student was not taking notes but cleaning his finger nails! Kuenen, too, is waning. First the pastors of Amsterdam fell in with his heresy. But they soon found that it emptied their churches. "They came together," says an Amsterdam pastor, "asked God's forgiveness, resolved to abandon Kuenen's theology and return to the historic faith of Holland. They are now preaching the Bible again to full churches, as the reformers preached it."

When we turn to England, Scotland and Ireland we find Professor Pusey, Regius Professor of Hebrew in Oxford, and Dr. D. S. Margoliouth, Jewish professor of Arabic at Oxford; Dr. John Urquhart; Dr. George C. M. Douglas, professor of Hebrew in the Free Church College of Glasgow, and Dr. Leitch, president of Assembly's College, Belfast; Dr. John Smith of Edinburg, author of "The Integrity of the Scriptures"; Professor G. Patterson Smith, author of "The Old Document and the New Bible," and "How We Got Our Bible." Dr. Archibald Henry Sayce, professor of Assyri-ology of Oxford; Dr. Emil Reich, author of "The Bankruptcy of Higher Criticism." Bishop Welldon, also the Dean of Canterbury. Dr. P. H. Wace, and Sir Robert Anderson, King's Counsellor, K. C. B., LL. D., author of "Christ and Criticism." Who speaks of "The sham criticism of the German Skeptical crusade against the Bible, which is now fathered by so many English scholars, professors, and theologians of inferior rank. I say this because not a single English Theologian of the first rank has identified himself with the movement." Sir Robert Anderson further declares, "Their great influence conies not from superior scholarship, but from the positions they fill as ministers and professors. Their power to attack the Bible is mainly due to positions they have gained by giving solemn pledges that they would defend the Bible. They accept the Christian's creed, while they destroy the foundations on which it rests, posing meanwhile as persons of superior enlightenment and intelligence! In no other sphere would such trifling be tolerated. If only these men could-be 'got into court' and subjected to cross-examination, they would lose not only their case but their reputation. Let no one be brow beaten out of one's belief by these attacks on Holy Scripture. The critics represent indeed that the scholarship of Christendom is with them. But the claim is absolutely unfounded."

This great lawyer is a reasoner, and is said to be "one of the brainiest men in the British Empire," and he has entered this field of theological controversy out of his love for the Bible and Christianity, and his profound disgust with the baseless assumptions and fallacious reasoning of the higher critics, and because of the peril which he believes this passing wave of infidelity is bringing, to the Empire. The claims of these critics to superior knowledge reminds us of little boys jumping up and down on the scales to make themselves weigh more.

With Sir Robert Anderson, are standing such leaders of thought as "the Bishops of Durham and Argyle; the Archdeacon of Liverpool; the Canons, Faussett, Courtenay, Morr, Gayer, and Griddle-stone. Such scholars as Dr. Wace, dean of Canterbury and principal of Kings College, London; Dr. Landish, professor of Arabic, in Oxford; Dr. Clayton, Rural Dean of Oxford; Dr. C. H. Wright, Bampton lecturer of Oxford; Dr. James Robertson, professor of Oriental languages in Glasgow University, and Dr. James Orr, professor of Systematic Theology, United Free Church College, Glasgow. Dr. Robert Watts, professor of Theology in Belfast. Dr. F. Watson of Cambridge, England.

We have given this list of scholars who still believe in an inspired Bible, and it might be indefinitely extended, for the benefit of the uninformed. Among them are many minds who are scholars of the highest repute, and many of them, too are more than the peers of these infidel critics in wide learning. When these critics boast that all scholars are agreed in accepting the findings of their infidel criticism, it is difficult to decide which is the greater, the audacity or the mendacity of their claims.

(19) Perhaps the last peculiar method of these critics which we will take the time to mention is their infidelic boasting-"all critics are agreed" and "the assured results of Biblical Criticism." This is nothing but buncombe. The critics are not agreed, and their results are not assured. They agree only as Pilate and Herod were agreed to combine against Jesus. Every reader of the critical literature knows that they constantly clash in their theories, their views and their so-called "results." They differ:

1. As to whether Genesis was all myth and legend, or whether there was a basis of historic fact;
2. As to whether there ever were any such persons as Abraham, Isaac and Jacob;
3. As to whether Moses was a real historic personage or a character of fiction; whether he ever wrote anything, or not;
4. Whether the Children of Israel were ever in Egypt or not;
5. As to how many different writers composed the Pentateuch, five, or "ten," or "eighteen," or "twenty-two";
6. As to whether "two" or "ten" or "ninety authors" wrote Joshua.
7. As to whether David wrote much, or little or nothing. Ewald thinks he wrote all or a part of fifteen Psalms. Driver thinks Ewald's list quite too extended. Professor Cheyne graciously admits that he might have had something to do with the eighteenth; but, after more mature deliberation, he kindly excuses him of all responsibility for having written anything for that disgraceful compilation of myths and forgeries called the Bible. Fortunate man! But what a narrow escape David had!
8. There was first the "Document Hypothesis." This was later displaced by the "Fragment Hypothesis." This was all overturned and refuted by the next generation of critics who were repelled by the inconsistencies and incongruities of the Fragment Theory. These invented the "Supplement Hypothesis." But this in turn was refuted, and a fourth scheme,-the "Crystallization Hypothesis" was proposed. Then a "Modified Document Hypothesis" was proposed.
9. These critics do not agree about Isaiah as to when it was written, or whether there were "two" Isaiahs, or ten or "one hundred and sixty" 11
10. They differ among themselves more than fifty years as to the date of the Fourth Gospel.

Thus are the critics "agreed" on a multitude of questions! To quote Professor Townsend of Boston University: "Professor Harnack almost fiercely assails the conclusions reached by Wellhausen. Wellhausen denies the Mosaic origin of the decalogue; Kuenen claims that the Exodus was an historical event; Stade says the thing was impossible and that the Israelites probably never dwelt in Egypt; Wellhausen gives one date for the Pentateuch; Professor Dillman another, and Professor Driver disputes them both, and decides that no one knows anything about it.

And if the conflicting views held on the one side by Professor Driver, and on the other side by the higher critic, Professor Cornill, as to the date and contents of Deuteronomy and Isaiah, were compiled they would make a book of many pages. This out and out higher critic, Professor Cornill, also berates Delitzsch because he irrationally exaggerates Babel at the expense of the Bible.

As to the origin of the book of Genesis, George Adam Smith, Dr. Driver, Dr. G- P. Peters, Dr. Cheyne and Dr. Briggs are at war with one another. In discussions on the so-called sources of the Pentateuch, one critic insists that "D" is earlier than "P"; others contend that "P" is earlier than "D," and as to the order in which "J," "E," "D," and "P" should be placed, almost every possible arrangement has been assigned by the critics. In a word, for more than half a century, "the whole realm of higher criticism has been characterized by the sound of clashing swords, and the scene of friend slaying, friend."

This is a truthful picture, and the half is not told. One of the critics uses such scathing terms against his fellows, as, "arrogance," "pretense of knowledge," "enormous traffic in hypotheses," "mania for piling up revolutionary theories," etc., etc.

It looks to an ordinary logical mind as if these "assured results," were nothing but a conglomerated hodge podge of infidel guesses, unproved theories, and unsubstantiated conjectures.

Professor Sayce of Oxford says: "Higher Criticism has betrayed the critic into a dogmatism as unwarranted as it is unscientific. Baseless assumptions have been placed on a level with ascertained facts; hasty conclusions, have been put forward as principles of science, and we have been called upon to accept the prepossessions and fancies of the individual critic as the revelation of a new Gospel,"

* * * * *

CHAPTER VIII -- HIGHER CRITICISM CONTINUED

IV. Notice the results of this criticism.

"By their fruits ye shall know them." The critics have been cutting and dissecting and mutilating and tearing to pieces the Bible for more than a century. If we take them at their word and believe what they say, they have taken our inspired Holy Bible, which gave us the revealed and authoritative will of God as an infallible guide to heaven, and put it through their critical machine, and hand it back to us a mince meat of myths, fables, inventions, folklore tales, sagas, legends, pious frauds and well intended forgeries!

They take our Bible, written by holy men "as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," and hand back to us a purely human "scrap-book of anonymous compilations" with which lie Holy Spirit had nothing whatever to do, made by an indefinite number of unknown, unknowable, and undateable pseudonymous redactors, with nothing in it inspired, miraculous, supernatural or divine, and which cannot speak with any authority to a human heart.

A professor in an American University founded by the consecrated money of a most noble Christian man writes a book "setting aside as unworthy of belief almost everything that hitherto has been accepted as Christian theology; the account of creation, the origin of sin, sacrificial religion, and Christ as the final judge of men, are without hesitation put on the retired list."

Another professor in a college founded by a Godly soul says: "Rationalism is the antithesis of all systems which depend on authority as the source of truth. Modern thinkers reject the strictly miraculous everywhere. Hence they reject the authority of the Scriptures. The incarnation is totally unintelligible, no theologian having yet succeeded in putting any intelligent meaning into the proposition that in Christ is found two natures, divine and human.

With the incarnation will also disappear the doctrine of the Trinity and the Atonement."

In another college, a professor was lecturing before a large class, when a ministerial student ventured to ask: "Doctor, what about the atonement of Jesus Christ?" He made no reply but turned to the blackboard and wrote in large letters, "Rot." In another school a professor said: "Whiskey brings temporary insanity, and so does a revival of religion. This is simply a form of drunkenness, no more worthy of respect than the drunkard in the ditch."

"Such language," says another, "is too mild, religious revivalism is a social bane more dangerous to society than drunkenness. As a sot, man falls below the brute; as a revivalist, he sinks lower than the sot." Think of Wesley, Finney and Moody!

From another school comes this: "Humanity cannot be saved through the suffering and crucifixion of Christ. Providence works no transformation upon the heart of a man through expiation by sacrifice, and ransom by blood." "There are no God-given commandments; incest is not contrary to the laws of nature, or disapproved by any fancied ordinances of God." "An attempt to divert or gratify God through worship, is as if a chemist should chant a litany to change the power of hydrogen."

An English Theologian teaches in a book that, "Jesus is not essentially unlike other men in kind. His power to heal did not differ in kind from that which other good men in His day possessed. He causes sin to be forgiven by awakening in men the spirit of repentance. He died because of loyalty to His own religious ideals, not to make it possible for an angry God to forgive. He certainly arose from the dead, not physically; but spiritually. All theories about a historic fall, original sin, and total depravity are foreign to the genius of modern thought."

A professor in another American University "pronounces as untenable and false such Christian tenets as Bible inspiration, Bible miracles, the immaculate conception, the resurrection of Christ, and the entire supernaturalism of the Scriptures." Another late book assures us that "Moses was a

myth, and Samuel a fortune teller; that the sojourn in Egypt is a fiction, and the book of Deuteronomy a document concocted after the exile, by a clever Jewish priest; that the miracles of the New Testament are legends, and the accounts of Christ's birth and resurrection are ingenious fabrications out of whole cloth."

A Bible class teacher in a Sunday school in America, of more than ordinary intelligence, recently said, that the Bible was of no more value for a class of young people than an old almanac! A few years ago, when the International Sunday school lessons were on Jesus' conversation in the Upper Chamber, and His Intercessory Prayer, a minister in a Congregational Church in Michigan, turned away from that glorious Scripture and taught a young man's Bible Class about "Portugal." These are choice specimens of the kind of fruit this Higher Criticism is bearing in our country on all sides.

Doctrinal Results in England

We turn to England and it is no better. Some books fresh from over the sea lie before us. One chapter in one of them wholly discredits the Virgin Birth. The next impeaches the sinlessness of Jesus, and denies that there were two natures in His person; and the last chapter denies the doctrine of the physical resurrection of our Lord. The writer admits that St. Paul believed it, but he does not. He further says: "Paul could believe that those who would be on the earth at the second coming would be changed in the twinkling of an eye, but we must not ask men today to believe so." And so he goes on, page after page, with bald rationalism.

Here is another volume from a clerical infidel. The most aggressive infidel in London says in his paper: "I am as much of a Christian as Dr. Reginald Campbell, and he is as big an infidel as I am." The following quotations are a proof. "No orthodox theologian of any repute now believes in an actual historical fall of the race. What I now wish to insist upon is that it is absolutely impossible for any intelligent man to continue to believe in the Fall as it is literally understood and taught." . . . "No doubt the Genesis myth about Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden forms the background of it, but it is not consonant with the doctrine itself. The Genesis narrative says nothing about the ruined creation or the curse upon posterity. There is no hint of individual immortality, much less of heaven and hell; no Christ, no cross, no future judgment, no vicarious atonement." . . . "There is a tendency to take the legend of the Fall more or less literally." . . . "Paul took some kind of a fall for granted when unfolding his system of thought. It is doubtful whether he took the Genesis story literally or not, and he certainly made Adam the type of the unideal or earthly man who had become estranged from God. . . . Right through Christian history the tendency has run to look upon the world as the ruins of a Divine plan marred by man's perversity and self-will. It is time we got rid of it, for it has had a blighting, deadening influence upon hopeful endeavor for the good of the race." . . . "Why should God feel himself so much aggrieved by Adam's peccadillo. If it were not for the theological atmosphere which surrounds the question we should see at once that it was ridiculous" . . . "The doctrine of the Fall is an absurdity from the point of view of ethical consistency and common sense." . . . "The Fall Theory is not only impossible in face of the findings of modern science; it is a real hindrance to religion."

"Jesus was God, but so are we. Jesus was not God in the sense that He possessed an infinite consciousness; no more are we." . . . "The doctrine of the virgin birth operates as a hindrance to

spiritual religion, and a living faith in Jesus. The simple and natural conclusion is that Jesus was the child of Joseph and Mary." . . . "An adherent of the so-called orthodox view of the Atonement believes that it is of the utmost value to Christian experience; which it is not, and never was. The doctrine as popularly held, is not only not true, but ought not to be true; it is a serious hindrance to spiritual religion. Why in the world should God require such a sacrifice before feeling Himself free to forgive His erring children?" . . . "One of the greatest stumbling blocks in the way of many devout and intelligent minds today is that of the supposed binding authority of the letter of Scripture." . . . "Apparently Paul's belief was that no one would ever have died but for the sin of Adam. Paul was wrong." . . . "There is no direct reference in the Old Testament to the atoning work of Jesus. The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, and all similar passages have nothing whatever to do with Jesus." ... "I know of nothing that is such a hindrance to Spiritual religion as the supposed authority of the letter of Scripture." . . . "Never mind what the Bible says about this or that if you are in search for truth." . . . "An everlasting hell is in the nature of things a contradiction. . . The soul is potentially infinite and cannot have its true nature denied." "What Paul thought about the resurrection of Jesus is now impossible to any one." . . . "Paul's theory as to the resurrection of every physical human body is just nonsense." "Sin is actually a quest for life, but a quest that is pursued in the wrong way. Sin is always a blunder." . . . "Salvation and Atonement are just as operative on the other side of death as on this. The blind soul goes on for a while in its blundering selfishness, and the Christ spirit goes on seeking to win it to the truth. In the end the truth must prevail."

So the author goes on, page after page, with sneers at the doctrine of the Fall, the Atonement and the Cleansing Blood, the Deity of Christ, the Resurrection, the authority of Scriptures, the evil of sin,-a horrible concoction of rationalism, infidelity, and conceited diabolism. This infidel preacher went on with his infidel rot till he wrecked one of the noblest churches in London.

We open another London publication a year old, and find the following nuggets of infidelity lying everywhere over the surface. "The Higher Criticism may be described as a virtual, though not intentional, (we doubt it) attack on the historicity of the Bible. The result has been to show in almost every part, if not every part, of Scripture that what we have is not history." "The Bible writer used facts when it suited his purpose, but he would have no hesitation in subordinating facts to his purpose" (deliberately lied). "As a result of the Higher Criticism the Four Gospels are a complete wreck as historical records. It is long since the Fourth Gospel was relegated to the realm of spiritual imagination. It is a pure assumption to suppose that there was any such nucleus of fact." "It can never be proved that a historic person called Jesus uttered the great teachings of this Gospel. The same is substantially true of the Synoptic Gospels. As authorities for a-life of Jesus they are hopelessly shattered by the assaults of the Higher Criticism. How little they tell us of an historic Jesus! And that little full of contradictions and discrepancies, of impossible incidents and errors... So called facts of history are, after all, very trivial matters. What can it interest the people of today to know what took place in Palestine two thousand years ago?" "Higher Criticism has destroyed the Virgin birth, as history. The same is true of almost every so-called incident in the synoptic gospels. It is impossible to regard as historical the Temptation, the Transfiguration, the cleansing of the Temple, and the numerous miracle incidents with which they are filled." "The Higher Criticism is beginning to lay its hands on the Trial and Death and Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus, and to point out the impossibility of reconciling these with history." . . . "Jesus was a Jewish fanatic bent on forcing on his death in order to precipitate the coming of the

promised Kingdom of Heaven." "A flesh and blood Christ is a contradiction in terms." "The story of the fall is not history but an allegory. Eden is no garden of earth, but the soul." "The voice that tempted Adam came from no serpent." "The idea that man is saved by a historical Savior who lived at a definite time in human history, is the great error of the Christian Church." "The four Gospels are not the biography of an individual (Jesus Christ) but a spiritual drama or allegory." "The Christ within is the spiritual self of every man, and is identical with the Divine Son of God ever living in the bosom of the Father." So every man is his own Christ. "A perfect person such as the historic Jesus is held to be, could not exist in the imperfect society of to-day, far less in the Graeco-Roman world of the first century." "The speeches of God reported by the prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, etc., must no doubt be regarded as legendary and imaginary." "The personal, careful, individual attention of Deity to prayer is neither needful nor credible." "The benefit of prayer is subjective only." "Christ Himself was a man of His age, without pretension to foreknowledge of the future of the world." "Supplicatory prayer is mainly a matter of long tradition, habit, and education, but there is no deep-seated belief among Christians in its being heard and complied with by God." "A sign of the times is the greater freedom of Sunday observance on the part of all classes. Motoring, cycling, excursions by train and steamboat, and even golfing are more or less common on the Lord's Day."

Doctrinal Results in Germany

Now we turn to Germany, the foul fountain of this mighty stream of Infidelity. Professor Bousset of Goettingen, says: "We can no longer adhere to the belief in miracles." Dr. Fischer of Berlin, affirms: "Our faith in God must not include a faith in miracles." The *Christliche Welt* says: "It must be regarded as settled that no miracles in the sphere of nature can be accepted." But we have a historic Christianity or none at all.

Dr. Boussett says: "The doctrine of the Trinity too, is lost in the development of modern theological thought." "Jesus was a human being and the Holy Spirit was no divine person." So, according to the infidel critic, the doctrine of Trinity is gone.

The same critic says: "Nowhere in history do we find any place for special divine revelation; of a divine working by the side of the human; of a supernatural exhibition of divine power in the history of a redemption." So the supernatural Bible is swept away as if it were a mere cobweb.

Ritschl says: "A passively inherited condition cannot be regarded as sin; the doctrine of original sin cannot be proved by experience. It is only a notion." "The idea of the universal corruption of the human race we cannot accept." So the doctrine of depravity, the basis of Pauline theology, is swept away.

Boussett says: "That which Matthew and Luke in the first chapters of their Gospels report concerning the beginnings of the life of Jesus is a myth and legendary." So Jesus, instead of being conceived by the Holy Ghost, was simply a bastard son of a fallen girl.

Wernle says: "Jesus was not sinless," and Boussett says: "His nature was not entirely free from evil." So our Jesus, "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners and higher than the heavens," is gone!'

Boussett says: "Tradition has made Jesus a miracle worker, who awakened the dead, walked upon the sea, commanded the winds and the waves, and fed thousands with a few loaves. All these stories are nothing but the outgrowths of legends. There is nothing unique in the life of Christ in this respect." So our Almighty Christ is dwarfed by Higher Criticism to the level of John Smith or Bill Jones!

Wernle declares: "Neither His blood nor His death has any special redemptive significance for us." "One thing is sure, namely, that the idea of a forgiveness of sins has nothing to do with the death of Jesus." And thus Christ's vicarious sacrifice and atonement are swept away, or contemptuously set at naught.

Pfleidever says: "The belief of the church is a mythical symbol wrapped in a pious phantasy." Harnack says: "We must have the Easter faith but not accept the Easter Message." Wernle declares: "The empty grave is an invention of the evangelists." Boussett says: "In the resurrection we see the lively contact of Jesus with His disciples." The Kirchliche Gegenwart affirms: "Words that came from a tomb that was empty amount to little." And thus Higher Criticism robs people of their faith in the resurrection, and with it Christianity is gone forever.

Boussett says: "In the expression 'Son of God' the dogma of the eternal Divine nature of Jesus cannot be found." Our faith is not dependent on the conviction of the superhuman, unique nature of the Redeemer-God, but on the earthly personal life of our Lord. Jesus never passed beyond the limit of the purely human. We no longer believe that Jesus was absolutely a different being from ourselves. He from above and we from below. We do not rob Jesus of his honor if we do not accept His divinity." Hamack says: "Christ was a man of a limited world of thought, but with a pronounced consciousness of God." All this is simply bald Unitarianism.

Fischer says: "Jesus, because he was Himself religious and humanly pious, cannot be an object of religious adoration; as He prayed Himself, no prayers can be addressed to Him." So hush your prayers, these critics would say, to your Divine Savior; for it is a waste of time and breath..

Boussett says: "Jesus never demanded a faith in Himself, but only in God (see Mark 2:5; John 3: 16, 3: 36, 14: 1 and Matthew 18: 6). Paul has changed the simple Gospel of Jesus into a faith in Christ, and in this way has materially changed the Gospel." Wernle says: "It is foolishness to speak of a faith or of a justification." Julicher says: "The Protestant doctrine of justification by faith is a lost dogma." "There is a practical agreement that Paul invented this doctrine." So St. Paul was an old fraud, and the doctrine of Salvation by Faith is buried by criticism forever.

And these infidel critics are as complimentary to the Old Testament as to the New Testament. "Abraham is a myth." "Joseph is an obvious Astral myth." It is uncertain whether Moses ever lived or not. Professor Winckler assures us that "Joshua was no human being, but was a personification of the Sun. His companion was Caleb. But Caleb stands for Kaleb, and Kaleb stands for Kelb, and Kelb is a dog. So of course, Caleb is clearly put for the dog star Sirius." Now who could resist such lucid, cogent reasoning? To the minds of these infidels it is as clear as mud and as certain as a weathervane.

Our theological students of America cross the sea to hear such rationalists and infidels, amidst the fumes of beer and tobacco-smoke, sneer at the Deity of Christ, mock at the efficacy of His cleansing blood, deny the depravity of the race, to save us from which He died, deride His miracles as myths, scoff at His resurrection, ridicule justification by faith, and insult the Holy Ghost.

Then they come back to America, and by wire-pulling and dexterous arts, get into theological professorships and prominent pulpits, and proceed to ventilate their up-to-date knowledge. With daring irreverence and flippant conceit, they dissect and mutilate and criticize the Holy Book, deny its authenticity, make light of its miracles, deride the superhuman and the supernatural, and teach that the Bible is a compilation of legends and inventions and forgeries which, in some inexplicable way, got palmed off on the keenest minded nations and in the most intellectual age of ancient history as the Word of God! And the poor, unfortunate world has waited eighteen long, weary centuries for these smart infidels to arise and point out our mistake! O what a boon these dear critics have brought to us! We can now go back and live like heathen, wallowing in sin, with no inspired Bible to rebuke us, and no Divine Savior to save us, and no Holy Spirit to trouble us, and wander on in darkness, "having no hope and without God in the world"!

Spiritual Effects.

Let us now look away from the teaching, to the moral and spiritual effects of Higher Criticism on the people. Perhaps the effect is best seen in Germany; for there the disease started and has reached its crisis. Dr. Townsend of Boston quotes Dr. E. Petersilie one of the leading statisticians of Prussia, as follows: "The thirty million Germans in 1830, sent to the universities, 4,267 students to study theology. In 1905 with a population of fifty-five millions, if the ratio had kept up, there would have been 7,854 students of theology; but there were only 2,352. In 1830 the theological students constituted 30 % of the whole student body. But in 1905 they constituted but six per cent. During the last ten years law and medical students have increased more than half.

When Berlin had over a million people, she had but one hundred and ten ministers of religion, and their average congregation was less than one hundred. It was reported seven years ago "that largely throughout Germany the churches have almost done away with evangelical beliefs and evangelistic efforts. Society is socialistic and coming to be anarchistic. Men's souls are sick, and suicide is prevalent as never before." A German student of such problems tersely says: "Germany is now reaping the harvest of her advanced thought; the prisons are full." Dr. Baur, one of the imperial chaplains, in a sermon preached before the Emperor, said: "Affection, faith and obedience to the Word of God are unknown in this country, which formerly was justly called the home of faith. Marriages are concluded without the blessings of the Church; we have a Sunday only in name; the afternoon and evening of it are spent by plain people in public houses and music halls; while the upper classes rush to the races, preferring to hear the panting of tortured horses rather than sentences from the Word of God."

The hopeful sign in the sky of religious thought is that there is a widespread alarm in Germany over the peril threatening the German people, in consequence of this advanced theology. Great mass meetings have been held in the interest of faith in the Old Bible in German cities. There was no auditorium in all Leipsic large enough to hold the people who wished to attend. Professor

Hommel said: "I seem to see signs of the approach of a new era, in which men will brush away the cob-web theories of the Higher Critics, and attain clearer perception of real facts, and increase of godlessness following this teaching.

Since these German confessions were written the great world war, launched by Germany, has come and gone. The revelation it made of the degradation of the moral character of the German people has shocked the moral sense of the civilized world. Their barbarities have surpassed all historic deeds of barbarism. Their deeds of savagery have outdone all the recorded acts of the most savage tribes ever discovered. Their self-confessed diabolism written down in their diaries boasting, and found in the pockets of their dead soldiers, would shame the fiends of hell. Germany deliberately trained her youth for years to this unfeeling cruelty that they might be ready for the great struggle for world dominion. By their own college-professors' books, and the daily training of their schools, they got rid of conscience, and popularized the war-license to cruelty, lawlessness, murder and lust. And when the war they had planned for a generation broke, they were ready to put the vandal torch to universities, and libraries, gather the defenseless into churches and shoot them or burn them alive; ready to shoot the wounded on the battlefields, and bomb hospitals; and carry off thousands of females for purposes of lust, and murder the aged, and crucify and starve prisoners, and stick their bayonets through babies and swing them over their shoulders, and sing as they marched; ready to poison wells, and to sink the peaceful ships of commerce freighted with innocent human lives.

This people, that once led the world in Christian virtue and piety, became a nation of trained intellects and leprous hearts, to whom crimes were virtues, whose solemn covenants were "scraps of paper," whose statesmen were villains, whose diplomats had secret agents carrying bribes, organizing sedition, maturing plots and foulest crimes against nations with whom they were at peace, thus raising diplomacy to the nth degree of infamy. Their editors justified, their state-preachers defended, and their university professors and rulers glorified the sinking of women and children on steamers, "the rape of Belgium and Northern France, the assassination of Poland, the deliberate, cold blooded plot to exterminate Armenians." Their favorite philosopher boasted that he had "slain God," and declared that Germany's gift was brute force and not intellect. Their author-general declared that "weakness is the only sin against the Holy Ghost." Their All-Highest Kaiser with mildewed lips christened his soldiers "Huns," and his generals burned the name into their foreheads with the hot implements of merciless war—a brand they will carry for untold generations. No nation of history ever fell into such an abysmal depth of infamy in so short a time. And Germany could not have done it, if she had not first destroyed the influence of the Bible upon the minds of her people from princes to peasants, turned from the worship of Christ and Jehovah, and made the Devil her God.

In England there has also been a decline of evangelical piety as a result of this infidel criticism. All the leading independent denominations reported a decline in membership in 1910, and one strong denomination had declined in membership five years in succession. Strikes, and anarchy, and class hatred, and bitterness, and Sabbath desecration, and irreligion generally are as sure to follow this teaching as darkness succeeds the setting of the sun. "The entrance of thy Word bringeth light." A discredited Bible means moral darkness to the people.

Professor Townsend of Boston well says: "When people are told that scholars have decided, that the Bible is a book of fables and myths; that it is without special authority; that the hell it describes is only 'a medieval nightmare' only 'an invention to frighten weak-minded and superstitious people'; that God is too merciful to punish sinners, however much steeped in guilt-when told this and when it is believed, will oaths in the work-shop and on the street be fewer and less blasphemous? Will bitterness be less bitter and hopelessness less hopeless? Will the strike be less angry and bloody, or the occasion for it less aggravating? The man who says, 'yes,' is as ignorant of human history and of human nature as a monkey, from whom some of these scholars who are inveighing against the Bible, insist they have descended."

In the United States the results of this Higher Criticism are the same as elsewhere. It naturally breeds only desolation and death. Crimes and violence, murder and suicides are increasing, and naturally follow in its wake. It breeds evil and only evil, and that continually.

Here are some church statistics from the most reliable sources. In 1893 four per cent of the M. E. churches were barren, that is had no converts for a year. In 1905 there were eight per cent barren; the number of barren Presbyterian churches in 1893, was nineteen per cent; the number in 1905 was twenty-nine per cent. In 1893 the number of barren Congregational churches was twenty-five per cent, and in 1905 the number was forty-one per cent. The aggregate number of churches in these three denominations which in 1905 did not add a single soul on confession was nearly 7,000.

From 1902 to 1905, there was an actual loss of 164,000 Sabbath school scholars in United States when there should have been a gain of 751,000 scholars to keep pace with the growth of population. At a great Sunday school convention in 1911 Rev. Edward Blake said: "The Evangelical churches of America are facing a very serious situation. The six leading denominations showed a net increase of only 384,000 members in 1910. This represents the combined efforts of more than 160,000 churches, 17,000,000 members and an expenditure of \$250,000,000 yearly. Each net gain of one represents the year's work of forty-four church members, and the cash outlay of \$650.00.

The New York Tribune informs us that of the two hundred and two leading colleges in United States at the commencement in June, 1911 there was a falling off of fifteen per cent in the number of graduates deciding to enter the ministry. This has now been going on for twenty years, and all this while our population increases one million a year. From our one hundred theological seminaries, there were 66 fewer graduates entering the ministry than the year before. There were twenty-five per cent fewer men graduated in 1911 than the churches demand for immediate service.

A Religious Weekly informs us, that "30,000 Methodist Churches in the land, in the past four years had but 28,000 converts." It seems incredible that that great church, once such a revival power, has fallen so low and become so weak. But they are playing with this specious infidel criticism in high places, and it is surely doing its deadly work. The New York Christian Advocate of 1911 says: "Conversions are comparatively few in Protestant Churches, and are becoming fewer still with each passing year. . . . We are rapidly approaching the crisis... In 1927, a government official reported 60,000 Protestant churches in the United States that did not have a convert. Surely such an array of statistics furnishes food for very serious thought. But can these things be wondered at?"

After we have allowed conscienceless infidels to destroy our Bible-the life-giving Book, and undermine our faith in its eternal verities, what else could we expect? If what these critics are saying is true, who can blame the bright minded college students of Germany, England and America for not entering the ministry? They would have no authoritative truth to proclaim, no Divine, Omnipotent Savior to hold up, no atonement for sin to offer, no heavenly message to preach. If they accept the teaching of the critics they are infidels themselves; and then to enter the evangelical ministry and pretend to preach Christianity, is to brand themselves as infamous hypocrites!

The religious statistics of January, 1913 show that Congregationalists in England lost the year previous 2,221 members and 3,178 from the Sabbath school. The Baptists lost 2,500 church members, and 4,900 from the Sabbath School. The Primitive Methodists lost 848 church members. There has been an annual loss of members among Methodists and Congregationalists for five years, and among the Baptists for seven years. Every church in England suffered decline but the Roman Catholics.

The Literary Digest of February 22, 1913, shows us that in the United States the loss in the net increase in 1912 as compared with that of 1911 is 300,000-almost one-third. In all the churches Roman Catholic and Protestant, with 36,675,000 church members there was an increase of 579,000; which means that it required the labor of 63 communicants for each net gain of one, even with immigration to help them.

It is, at the best, a painful showing, and as says the "Christian Advocate of New York," "gives Christians an occasion for serious thought," The truth is that Higher Criticism and its bastard child, "New Theology," and all their infidel progeny are being weighed in the balance and found wanting.

It is time we think very seriously before we proceed farther in the direction we are now going. We need to "about face" and "double-quick march" back to the old faith in an inspired Bible, and a Divine Son of God, and the atonement through His blood, and a sanctifying Holy Ghost who endues with power from on high.

V. The Fallacies of the Critics, Scriptures Vindicated.

In discussing this point we may begin anywhere. It will make no difference. The folly of the critics will appear, and the truth of Scripture will be amply vindicated. The facts will speak for themselves.

1. The critics assume that if a book can be dissected, and by adroitly selecting passages, and putting them together, two or more continuous and connected stories can be made, then it is a sure sign that the book is a compilation of those previously written accounts, or documents. But the defenders of the Bible have abundantly shown that any book can be subjected to the same mode of treatment with a like result. As Dr. Green shows: "Paragraphs of greater or less extent can be removed from any piece of writing whatever without the reader suspecting it, unless he is informed of the fact. The proofs are abundant that each of the so-called documents either directly alludes to, or presupposes, what is contained in the others. This is, of course, quite inconsistent with the

hypothesis of their independent origin. The utmost pains have been taken by the critics to avoid this interrelation, but it has been impossible for them to prevent it altogether."

Professor Green himself has tried his hand at it, and divided the parable of "The Prodigal Son," and of "The Good Samaritan," with much more show of reason than the critics have divided Genesis. He concludes: "These illustrations are sufficient to give an idea of the method by which the critics undertake to effect the partition of the Pentateuch; and to show how they succeed in creating discrepancies and contradictions, where none really exist, by simply sundering what properly belongs together. The ease with which these results can be accomplished, where obviously they have no possible significance, shows how fallacious and inconclusive this style of argument is. No dependence can be placed upon a process that leads to palpably erroneous conclusions in other cases. An argument that will prove everything proves nothing. And a style of critical analysis which can be made to prove everything composite is not to be trusted. A professor shows that Knight's History of England can thus be decomposed into five apparently original documents all written on different subjects. A scholar declares that he can divide Csesar's Commentary on his Gallic Wars into four separate books, and make it appear plausible. Professor Mead of Hartford Theological Seminary, has thus divided in an ingenious way, "The Epistle to the Romans," to illustrate the utter deceptiveness of such higher criticism. "Any book in the Bible, or out of the Bible, could be spliced and splintered in the same way and by the same method of argument."

2. The second fallacy is the assumption of the critics that two accounts of similar events must be different accounts of the same event. For example Abraham's deception about his wife, and Isaac's deception about his, are declared to be only one event described in two documents which have been compiled. The same argument may be and has been, made about the feeding of the multitudes on two occasions by Jesus. But such a principle of interpreting literature, if adopted, would throw all history into confusion. Doubtless the higher critics of three thousand years from now will decide that the two battles at Bull Run in successive years in the late war of the rebellion, both issuing in the defeat of the northern army, were merely different accounts of the same battle. But there would not be a shadow of proof that there was but one battle. The conclusion would simply be based on the assumption or imagination of the critics.

So the critics first adopt an assumption that our Bible is not trustworthy history. Then the record of the sacred historian is set aside, in favor of the baseless conjecture of the hostile critics. "This reveals the unfriendly animus of the current critical analysis of the Bible which is inwrought into it, and inseparable from it." It is essentially hostile, untrue to fact, and unscientific.

3. It is another fallacy of the critics to reject as historic any event in the Bible because there is dissimilarity in the different Scriptural accounts of it. They industriously pick out the discrepancies and disagreements, which may be only omissions, magnify them into large proportions, and then foolishly decide that the event itself was only a creation of fiction. They have thus scoffingly set aside the story of Christ's resurrection and a hundred other great facts of sacred history.

Let us see how this would work in modern history. Read Greeley's History of the civil war in the United States; then read Pollard's and carefully note the hundreds of disagreements. No histories agree about the single battle of Gettysburg. But was there no war between the North and the South,

and no battle of Gettysburg? This great nation is not yet recovered from the expense and agonies of that awful conflict; and you could not quite persuade the South that there was no fight at Gettysburg.

It is said that there are several accounts of the battle of Sedan, the great historic struggle between France and Germany, all written by eye witnesses, and one of them by a famous general of the American Army. "There are hopeless and bewildering discrepancies in regard to details." No two accounts agree; and, though hundreds of thousands of soldiers are still living who fought in that battle, no one can find out just how it occurred. Shall we therefore deny that there was a war and a battle? Only the hostile infidel critics, who are bent on destroying the Bible, reason in that way. It would be difficult to persuade France that something very serious did not take place at Sedan, the bitter memory of which will haunt the minds of Frenchmen for generations to come.

4. Another fallacy of the critics is the assumption that, in two compared writings, similarity of style, proves identity of authorship. Schmauk observes: "It is more easy for two authors, if they have the same order of mind, the same subject and thought, the same atmosphere and environment, the same training, the same common fund of information, to have some striking resemblances and similarities, than to avoid them."

An illustration of the viciousness of the application of this fallacy, is the attempt on the part of the higher criticism, by Ignatius Donnelly, in his "The Great Cryptogram," and by others, to prove that there never was a Shakespeare, and that the latter's plays were written by Francis Bacon.

It appears that Bacon kept a commonplace book, which is now in the British museum, and which contains 1,655 entries. Many of the suggestive and striking phrases, proverbs, aphorisms, metaphors and quaint turns of expression jotted down in it are also found in the plays of Shakespeare. Two of these entries appear in a single sentence in Romeo and Juliet. The critic says that, "Peculiarities of thought, style, and diction are more important in a contested case of authorship than the name of the title-page." He further says that Bacon was most learned and a great wit and imaginative, while of Shakespeare we know little, and so he arrives at the conclusive demonstration that there never was a Shakespeare. Ignatius Donnelly is as conceited, and supremely satisfied over his argument against Shakespeare's existence as the infidel critics are certain of their annihilation of Moses. But we visit Straford-on-Avon, and see the room in which little William was born, and the museum full of collected relics, and the oak desk on which the young scamp carved his name in school, and on another street to the southeast is the schoolhouse in which he was studying, now nearly four hundred years ago; and on the next street east is the Memorial Theater, erected to his memory; and farther down the Avon to the southeast is the church where he is buried; and yonder to the southwest is the thatched cottage, and great fireplace, and the seat beside it on which he sat and courted Ann Hathaway. And the whole town lives on the glory and fame of this man whom the critics have relegated to the realm of myth and fable.

5. Another fallacy of the critics is the assumption of their possession of a marvellous subjective literary instinct, "a perspicacity, verging on omniscience" by which they determine with the utmost assurance, the authorship not only of books, or large sections, or paragraphs, but of individual sentences and clauses, and fragments of clauses! Now nothing is more fallacious in the history of literature than this has proved to be.

The scholarly F. A. Wolf more than a hundred years ago (1795) threw doubts on Homer's authorship of the Iliad and Odyssey. It was assumed that the Greeks did not have literary writing farther back than the sixth century before Christ. Finally the critics became so bold as to doubt the very existence of the Greek heroes and of Troy itself. Heroes, Troy and Homer were all relegated to the realm of legends. But Schliemann's spade, unearthing Troy, resurrected the heroes from their graves, and covered the critics with confusion and shame.

The same Wolf, cast doubts upon Cicero's orations. This was taken up by others who were ambitious to appear smart, when Orelli in 1836 decided that Cicero did not deliver either the Second, Third or Fourth Oration, though Cicero himself published them, and claimed them all in a letter to Atticus. The critic reaches the incredible conclusion that the orations were forged and the letter was forged after Cicero's death; and by whom? By Cicero's own freedman, Tiro!!! The critic would have us believe that this faithful friend of his master, who had never made a speech in public in his life, thought to honor Cicero, the greatest and most polished orator Rome ever produced, by forging three orations and publishing them in his master's name, so soon after his death; and that he succeeded in making all the world believe for eighteen centuries that Cicero delivered them!

It is precisely such drivelling foolishness as this that is tinkering away at our Bible. Sir Robert Anderson, the great London lawyer says: "In no civilized country would an habitual criminal be convicted of petty larceny on such evidence as these critics bring forward. And yet on these 'grounds of probability,' and 'plausible arguments,' we are called upon to give up our sacred books which our Divine Lord accredited as 'the Word of God.'"

Professor Sanday, who poses as a conservative critic, that is, tries to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds, kindly admits that "there is an element in the Pentateuch derived from Moses himself." An element! But he cautiously adds, "However much we may believe that there is a genuine foundation in the Pentateuch, it is difficult to lay the finger upon it, and to say with confidence, here Moses himself is speaking. The strictly Mosaic element in the Pentateuch must be indeterminate. We ought not, perhaps, to use them without reserve, for Moses himself." Now the reason of this excessive caution is perfectly plain. If Sanday should put his finger on one little verse and say, "Moses wrote this," the whole pack of boar-hound critics would be on him in a trice, and gore him to death. He wishes to train with them, and yet not wholly break with Christian faith and decency.

But is not all this most remarkable? These smart, ambitious, infidel critics can find a rabble of unheard-of singers composing the most remarkable poems, of the Greek race; but they cannot find Homer. He is "merely a popular illusion." They can find Cicero's freedman; but they cannot find Cicero in his own orations. They can find the rabble of unknown, and unheard of and purely imaginary E's and J's and D's and P's and R's and Q's without number, for whose very existence there is not one shred of traditional or historic evidence; but they cannot find Moses in the Book he claimed to write, and which has been attributed to him for 3,500 years. Moses the hero of the ages, and the most potential purely human character that ever walked this planet I Verily, there are no moral fools so big, and hopeless and helpless as those whom God gives over to believe the lie they love.

6. Another fallacy of the critics is a stupid and apparently wilful blindness to the fact that a "heterogeneous miscellany,"-a compilation of scraps from an unlimited number of unheard-of authors scattered through many centuries, would never produce a literary work like the Pentateuch. It is "a coherent whole, possessing orderly arrangement in accordance with a well-devised plan, which is consistently carried out with a continuous narrative." Says Professor Green, "With no abrupt transitions, and no such contrasts or discords as would inevitably arise from piecing together what was independently conceived and written by different persons at different times, and with no regard to mutual adjustment." "It has one theme from first to last to which all that it contains relates. This is throughout treated upon one definite plan which is steadfastly adhered to. And it contains a continuous, unbroken history from the creation to the death of Moses, without any chasms or interruptions."

In the same strain writes Dr. Schmauk: "The negative theory fails to note the force of the argument from general internal consistency. Take the Pentateuch. It is strong presumption in its favor, that the whole, as a whole, forms a unit in plan, purpose and theme. In spite of such divergencies as the details of history and of actual life ever verify, the book is not an artificial construction, but an organic growth. Its laws are interwoven in the historic background, and there is no intimation that they ever existed separately.

"The Book of Deuteronomy consists of three addresses by Moses to the people and an historical appendix. Those addresses are intimately related to one another and to the laws which are included in the second address; the aim of the whole being to urge Israel to obey these laws. The style and language are identical; one spirit reigns throughout, and like recurring phrases frequently reappear. The objections to the unity of the main body of the book, and to Moses as its author, are of the most trivial description. In the appendix, Moses is expressly said to have written the song, and to have spoken the blessing.

"The laws in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, are so intimately blended with the history as to be inseparable. Whoever wrote the one must have written the other likewise. And Genesis is plainly conceived and written as introductory to the Mosaic history and legislation. One consistent topic and method of treatment is maintained; there are implications and allusions in one portion to what is found in other portions by way of anticipation or reminiscence, which bind all together."

"Then there are the Psalms, the contents of a large number of which would fix their date, if it was any other book than the Bible. They are just such compositions as David and the great men of his time would have written, and they do not fit the age of the Maccabees to which the critics assign them. And it is so with the historic books.

"On the whole, the argument from internal consistency militates against the theory of a post-exilian pious fraud, unheard of in the history of the world."

7. Another colossal fallacy of the critics was the assumption that the Tribes of Israel were "the merest wandering Bedouins," and Moses was too ignorant to be the author of anything, and that a code of laws, such as are ascribed to him, could not have been originated at so early an age in the world. We will let Professor Sayce, of Oxford, recognized throughout the world as an authority in

Assyriology, Egyptology, and Archaeology, give answer. He says: "We are just beginning to learn how ignorant we have been of the civilized past, and that it was literary from the very earliest, remotest past, Babylonia and Assyria were filled with libraries; and the libraries were filled with thousands of books. While the Egyptians could not even hew a tomb out of the rocks, without covering its walls with lines of writing. All these conjectures of the critics the testimony of monuments prove untenable. The evidence of Oriental Archaeology is distinctly unfavorable to the pretensions of the higher criticism. "The art of writing in the ancient East, so far from being of modern growth, was of vast antiquity, and the two great powers-Egypt and Assyria, which divided the civilized world between them, were each emphatically a nation of scribes and readers. Centuries before Abraham was born, Egypt and Babylonia were alike full of schools and libraries, of teachers and pupils, of poets and prose writers, and of the literary works which they had composed.

Egyptian literature goes back almost to the earliest period of its history. Notes written in a cursive hand have been found in the tombs of the First Dynasty (which according to M. Mariette was 5,000 B. C.). The Proverbs of Ptah-hotep, in fact, though written more than five thousand years ago represent the close of a period in the history of Egyptian literature. They had been preceded by earlier books many of which survived to a later day.

There were moral philosophies, historical novels, political satires, and books of travel. No one could live in Egypt without coming under the spell of its literary culture.

Babylonia, too, was a great commercial community, and for the purposes of trade, a knowledge of reading and writing was required among all classes.

There were grammars and dictionaries, vocabularies, phrase-books and interlinear translations of other languages, as well as grammatical analyses, and explanations of difficult passages, before Abraham was born. There have lately been discovered by Dr. Hilprecht of the University of Pennsylvania and the American excavators at Nippur in Northern Babylonia, seventeen thousand tablets, the most recent dating 2,280 years before Christ. The Babylonia of the age of Abraham was a more highly educated country than the England of George III."

For a long time the critics daringly and impudently affected to sneer at these discoveries. But in 1887 they were rudely shocked by the discovery of the Tel el-Amarna Tablets on the eastern bank of the Nile. "They showed that the Mosaic age instead of being an illiterate one, was an age of high literary activity, and education throughout the civilized East. This culture was shared by Asia Minor and Syria, and Palestine. From one end of the civilized ancient world to the other, men and women were reading and writing and corresponding with one another; schools abounded and great libraries were formed in an age which the smart infidel critics declared was almost wholly illiterate. Moses not only could have written-the Pentateuch, but it would have been little short of a miracle had he not been a scribe. The age of Moses, and even the age of Abraham was almost as literary an age as our own."

A Babylonian account of the Deluge has been discovered which is in wonderful agreement with the account in Genesis. "It must have been known," says Sayce, "in Canaan, long before Moses was born. Indeed it must have been familiar to Abraham himself, before he migrated from Ur."

"At the end of the year 1901 an important discovery was made in Susa-'Shusan the palace,' as it was called in the Book of Daniel. There M. de Morgan's excavations brought to light the blocks of polished marble, covered with cuneiform characters. It was found that they embodied a complete code of laws, the earliest yet discovered, earlier than that of Moses by eight hundred years, and the foundation of the laws promulgated and obeyed throughout Western Asia.

This discovery utterly downed the critics. They had told the world that the Prophets preceded the Law, because the civilization of the world was not advanced enough to make such laws in Moses' age. They denied: 1. That writing was used for literary purposes in the time of Moses; 2. That a legal code was possible before the period of the Jewish kings. But the Tel el-Amarna tablets disproved the first assumption; the discovery of the code of Kham-murabi has disproved the second. The codification of the law, therefore, was no new thing in the days of Moses. Not only could the Hebrew leader have compiled a code of laws; we now see it would have been incredible had he not done so.

There are great similarities between them, and it is quite evident that the great Lawgiver of Israel had the code of his predecessor before him when he wrote. The Mosaic code relates to the needs of a wandering people, and must belong to the age to which tradition assigns it, and presupposes the historical conditions which the Biblical narrative describes. No writer of a post-Mosaic date could have imagined or invented them. Thus the critics' evolution theory is overthrown; the Law preceded the Prophets; the Bible is vindicated, and the Higher Criticism, as usual, goes down in utter defeat!

"The early chapters of Genesis have a Babylonian coloring and background. The discovery of the Babylonian story of the Deluge was followed by that of the Babylonian story of creation, which showed that here, too, the cuneiform tablets and the Book of Genesis were in close accord. The cosmological story must have been known to Abraham before he left Ur of the Chaldees; for they were pictured on the walls of the Babylonian temples and taught in the Babylonian schools. The resemblance between the Babylonian Epic of the Creation and the first chapter of the Book of Genesis is too striking not to attract attention. 1. In both alike there is in the beginning a watery chaos, above which the darkness brooded while 'the earth was without form and void.' 2. In both alike the creation of the present world commences with the creation of light. 3. In both there is a firmament dividing the waters above from the waters beneath. 4. In both the creation of the heavens and earth preceded the appointment of the heavenly bodies to measure time. 5. In both the creation of man is the consummation of the Creator's acts. 6. The artificial division of the Babylonian epoch into seven books, corresponds with the seven days of the Hebrew account. Undoubtedly the earlier epic was known to Moses, but he made a remarkable difference. The Genesis story has no rival God to the Great Creator, and no materialism. The Eastern Epic commences with the description of a formless matter, independent of the Creator, generating itself and developing into the divine. In the Genesis story, chaos and the deep were not the first of things; God was already there, and His breath or Spirit brooded over the abyss. The Hebrew writer must have had the Babylonian version before him, and intentionally gave an uncompromising denial to all in it that impugned the omnipotence and Unity of God.

Whence came the revelation of the true nature of God, and His relation to man, which is announced in the first verse of the Pentateuch, and which stamps the literature of the Old Testament to the end? It did not come from Babylonia, or Canaan or Egypt. The higher critics have not accounted for it. After denying inspiration and the supernatural, they cannot. And when did this Babylonian Epic reach the author of the Pentateuch, but in the Mosaic epoch when there was such constant interchange of thought and literature between the Nile and the Euphrates? Thus the Old Bible and Mosaic authorship are vindicated once more.

8. Another fallacy of the critics, in perfect accord with the spirit of all infidelity, is "to make their own ignorance the measure of the credibility of the ancient documents" (Sayce). Time after time they have assumed the statements of the Bible to be untrue, because they did not know of any external evidence of support of biblical statements of fact. It is the same old Satanic spirit of infidelity that is determined not to believe anything in the Bible unless obliged to. All higher criticism is rank with it from start to finish.

Says Professor G. Frederick Wright, D. D., LL. D., of Oberlin: "Until the decipherment of the inscriptions on the monuments of Egypt and Assyria, the numerous references in the Bible to this mysterious people, the Hittites were unconfirmed by any other historical authorities, so that many regarded the biblical statements as mythical, and an indication of the general untrustworthiness of biblical history. A prominent English critic wrote not long ago that an alliance between Egypt and the Hittites was as improbable as would be one at the present time between England and the Choctaws. As late as 1904 a scholar said, 'I do not believe there ever were such a people as the Hittites.' But, lo! the excavators get to work and reveal in Palestine and Syria, and westward to Lydia, and northward to the Black Sea beyond Marsovan, a great people. As Schliemann's spade resurrected Troy from her grave of uncertainty, so Winkler's spade in 1906 resurrected Boghaz-Keui, seventy-five miles southwest of Marsovan (the principal capital of the Hittites). A great ancient empire was brought to light in Asia Minor, with central power, and treaty rights, on equal terms with the greatest nations of antiquity, thus making the Hittite power a third great power with Babylonia and Egypt. Rameses II, made a great treaty with this Hittite Empire, and a daughter of the Hittite king was given in marriage to Rameses." And thus, to the great chagrin of the infidel critics, the multitude of biblical references to the Hittites are completely corroborated. "It was pure ignorance and not superior knowledge, that led the critics to discredit the biblical historians." In this particular instance they were not to blame for their ignorance; but they were to blame for the diabolical use they made of it, by casting suspicions on the veracity of the Holy Book.

A college professor and higher critic said a few years ago in England: "There is no evidence that the Children of Israel were ever in Egypt." "Now in 1883 there were uncovered a short distance east of Bubastis, the remains of vast vaults which had served as receptacles for storing grain. The engineers of the railroad had unwittingly named the town Rameses. But from the inscriptions that were found it is seen that its original name was Pithom, and its founder was none other than Rameses II. It proves to be the very place where it is said in the Bible that the Children of Israel 'built for Pharaoh store-cities, Pithom and Raamses' (Ex. 1: 11) when the Egyptians made their lives bitter with hard bondage, in mortar and in brick." It was in connection with this work that the cruel oppression reached its climax, when they were compelled (after the straw failed) to gather stubble for themselves, and finally to make brick without straw.

Now as these store pits at Pithom were uncovered by Mr. Petrie, they were found (unlike anything else in Egypt) to be built of brick which contained straw, the middle layers were made of brick in which stubble instead of straw had been used, and the upper layers were of brick made without straw." "A more perfect circumstantial confirmation of the Bible account could not be imagined." Says Professor Wright, "Every point in the confirmation consists of unexpected discoveries. Thus have all Egyptian explorations shown that the writer of the Pentateuch had such familiarity with the country, the civilization, and the history of Egypt as could have been obtained only by personal experience." What honest man can doubt that the author was Moses?

Professor Wright tells us that "Among the places mentioned in the Tel el-Amarna correspondence carried on about 1,400 B. C. are Gebal, Beirut, Tyre, Accho, Hazor, Joppa, Ashkelon, Mak-kadah, Lachish, Gezer, Jerusalem, Rabbah, Sarepta, Ashtaroth, Gaza, Gath, Bethshemesh, all of which are familiar names, showing that the Palestine of Joshua is the Palestine known to Egypt in the preceding century. Also about 1,600 B. C. Thothmes III, conquered Palestine and gives in an inscription the names of more than fifty towns which can be confidently identified with those in the Book of Joshua. Finally, the forty-two stations named in Numbers 33, as camping places for the Children of Israel on their way to Palestine, can be determined in sufficient numbers to show that it is not a fictitious list, but a real history.

Professor Sayce, in his "Monumental Facts and Higher Critical Fancies," shows that all the archaeological discoveries prove that the geography of Egypt at the time of the Exodus agrees exactly with the account in the Bible, and it could not have done so either a short time before or afterward. "History fixes the Exodus of Israel in the epoch of the nineteenth Dynasty, and geography assigns it to the same date. To that period and to that period alone, does the geography of the Pentateuch apply. It describes events which actually took place. It is no fiction or myth, no legend whose only basis is folklore and unsubstantial tradition, but history in the real sense of the word. We may rest assured, 'criticism notwithstanding,' that Israel was once in Egypt, and that the narrative of its flight under the leadership of Moses is founded on sober fact."

Professor Wright quotes approvingly, Sir Walter Besant, secretary of the Palestine Exploration Fund, who said: "To my mind, absolute truth in local details, a thing which cannot possibly be invented, when it is spread over a history covering many centuries, is proof almost absolute as to the truth of the things related." "Such proof," says Professor Wright, "we have for every part of the Bible. These discoveries so unexpected, confirming so remarkably the truth of the Bible, can be nothing else than providential. When the faith of many was waning, and many heralds of truth were tempted to speak with uncertain sound, the very stones have cried out with a voice that only the deaf could fail to hear. Both in the writing and the preservation of the Bible we behold the handiwork of God."

But to all these confirmatory proofs the infidel critics are wilfully, wickedly deaf and blind. The plain, unvarnished reason is, because they did not have manhood and honesty enough to own their manifest defeat. They are determined to break down the power of the Bible over human hearts and lives. But when the heathen raged and the people imagined vain things against Jehovah and against His Anointed, saying, Let us break their bond's asunder and set aside the authority of their Word, He that sitteth in the heavens only laughed. He had the evidence for the truthfulness of his Book buried in the earth for thousands of years. He simply moved the excavators to ply their spades in

the right places, and up arose the past from the forgotten graves and swept away the arguments of their brazen effrontery of infidelity, as the breath of God scatters the chaff of the summer threshing floor.

9. It remains, in closing to call attention to the carnal spiritual dulness, and benumbed moral consciousness exhibited by these critics. They would have us believe that Godly men, like Ezra and others were the authors of colossal frauds and forgeries, and deliberately planned to cheat and deceive the whole people, in the interests of religion and civic righteousness! They would further have us believe that a holy God connived at all of this invention and falsification of documents, and set his seal upon it by using them to make known among men his holiness! Such a theory grossly maligns the great men of God, and also blasphemes the God that wrought through them. Any man not calloused to moral principle would instantly feel how abhorrent such theories were to Christian consciousness. After they have destroyed the very foundations of the Christian faith, and robbed the Bible of all inspiration, authority and Divinity, then they glibly chatter about the "Divine element" left, "that is more precious than ever." They never make plain to anybody what it is; but to their beclouded minds it is something quite consistent with forgery and falsification! Gibbering monkeys could show more sense.

After these critics, with daring profanity, have reduced the Savior of the world to the level of the common herd, nay, a little lower, by making Him "the son of Joseph born out of wedlock," or "the son of a Roman soldier by an unknown Jewish maiden"; after telling us that no angels sang at His birth, and He wrought no miracles, and spake with no special authority, and no superhuman knowledge, but only with the ignorance and the prejudices of a peasant of His age; and that "he did not die upon the cross but only swooned," and that "the stories of His resurrection, and of His ascension were fabricated by His devoted but deluded followers";-after telling us all this, these critics look at us with an idiotic leer and tell us that "it will make no difference with the essentials of Christian theology"!! The moral stupidity of such a remark is simply fathomless! The critics are only branding themselves as "profane fools." Let such rank heresy be widely proclaimed and universally believed, and who would read the Bible with the old time reverence and Godly fear? What would the man in the street, working for three dollars a day, care about the church, or the family altar, or secret prayer? What would restrain the criminally rich from oppressing the poor, who are already goaded by avarice and a consuming greed for gain? What would quell the riotous mobs in the great city strikes, stung by a sense of injustice and fired by the spirit of revenge? "There was no hanging in Chicago from October 22, 1909 until February 15, 1912, but in that time there were 800 homicides and murders," and, meantime, the professors in Chicago University were amusing themselves by criticizing the Bible and dethroning its influence over the people! A judge in a municipal court in New York City removed the Bible from his court room because it was a desecration to use it there! The courts of the whole country so notoriously corrupted by the great corporations and trusts and millionaires that the cry of indignation is rising from the whole land, and then reducing the Bible to the level of a work of fiction!!

A gentleman carefully studying New England life declares: "In ninety per cent of New England towns the large majority of people have no intelligent faith about anything, and do not wish to have. Serious religion which interferes with personal aims and pleasures is shunned, and its advocates ridiculed. The condition seems utterly hopeless. In such places the liberal preaching of the past decades, and the refined criticism of the Holy Bible have enabled the people to throw off

nearly all restraints of conscience, so that God is no longer loved or feared, and human life grows cheap. Wherever the pulpits of New England have been untrue to the Bible and to the Deity and authority of Christ, in those places irreverence, profanity, immorality and godlessness almost hopelessly exist."

And here is the influence this wretched criticism had upon a noble doctor of divinity, who was pastor of a church of twenty-five hundred members, until God in infinite pity rescued him: "The Old Testament was slipping away from me. I dreaded to open it, and I dared not shut it. The darkness seemed growing denser. On I pressed and stumbled; sometimes nearly losing my footing. The eddy became a maelstrom whose hissing and swirling waters threatened to suck me into their cavernous depths. None knew my agony, for I bore it in silence. Sunday after Sunday I went into my pulpit to preach the Gospel, while my heart was ready to break. I lost my childhood faith, and there was nothing to take its place."

Marcus Dods was one of the prominent higher critics of Scotland and England, and was the author of some commentaries. In 1918 he made this confession in print to the Christian world of his spiritual state in his own words: "I used to enjoy prayer, but for years I have found myself dumb. I wish I could live to be a spectator through the next generation, to see what they are going to make of things. The churches won't know themselves fifty years hence. It is to be hoped some little ray of faith may be left when all is done. For my own part, I am sometimes entirely under water and see no light at all."

This clipping was sent to me from England, and we read it to the students in this college chapel. That day a minister brought me a textbook he had been compelled to study in a M. E. Theological Seminary, written by this same Marcus Dods. Over one chapter, this student had written: "This chapter is from the pit."

On the margin of one passage, he had written "devilish." It was as follows: "Every one is already aware that the idea very widely prevails that the gospel miracles are an excrescence marring the beauty and simplicity of the life of our Lord, and that, if once they served a purpose, which is very doubtful, it were better now to say nothing about them."

After thus doing what he could to destroy the faith of others in the Bible, is it any wonder that his own faith was wrecked, and he could not pray?

Three years later, as all must, he came to die. From his deathbed, he sent forth this message through his son. "I now take no interest in prayer. I am down under the waters of doubt. I see no blue sky, no light." And so Dr. Marcus Dods, by his higher criticism, committed spiritual suicide, and went out in darkness to meet the Savior whose miracles he had derided.

Some years ago, a president of a holiness college chanced to be in Chicago, and went out to visit Chicago University. He asked a student on the college grounds, in what building President Harper taught. His laconic answer was: "President Harper makes infidels in that building over there!" What a comment for a college student to make about his president!

Some years ago a secular paper, "The Chicago Chronicle," made some caustic remarks about "Our Agnostic University," and Professors Foster and Smith. Here are some of the cutting words: "We are struck with the hypocrisy and treachery of these attacks on Christianity. This is a free country and a free age, and men can say what they choose about the Bible and religion without being called to account for it; but this is not what we arraign these divinity professors for. They are to be criticized on other grounds.

"Is there no place in which to assail Christianity but a divinity school? Is there no one to write infidel books except the professors of Christian theology? Is a theological seminary an appropriate place for a general massacre of Christian theology? Mr. Mangasarian delivers infidel lectures every Sunday in Orchestra Hall and no one is shocked; but why professional defenders of Christianity jump on it and assassinate it, the public-even the agnostic public cannot but despise them!"

If the expression of these infidel sentiments by Christian teachers makes a marked and saddening impression on mature minds, how must it affect the young people in attendance at the university? These young people are not contaminated by Mr. Mangasarian, nor by the teachers of Spiritualism, Theosophy and free thought who abound in Chicago; but when the very men whom they regard as the pillars of faith bend under them like a broken reed, it is inevitable that they will leave the university confirmed infidels!

Even so, we are not championing either Christianity or infidelity, but only condemning infidels masquerading as men of God and Christian teachers." Let Harry Emerson Fosdick and Bishop Brown take notice!

This infidel criticism has made infidels of thousands of college students, "clouded the open vision of many a preacher, silenced the divine voice in his soul, and opened the gateways to temptation and sin."

Wherever this new theology is preached there is found a spiritually incompetent pulpit shorn of its power, and a listless, unbelieving people who will soon desert the sanctuary and exchange the ministration of doubt and unbelief for the comforts of the parlor or the excitements of society and public amusement.

If the critics were not sunken in spiritual dullness they would be horrified by the fruit of this tree of their own planting. They would behold this growing infidelity in social and commercial life; in courts of justice and in business; in workshop and street life; in political and official positions, that has steadily kept pace with the growth of this higher criticism and new theology and is the logical sequence of it, and stand aghast at the work of their own hands. But not they! It is precisely the result that the skeptical, rationalist leaders have aimed at all along. They caress this hideous brat of their own begetting, and glory in their shame.

Another evidence of their carnal, spiritual blindness, is their treatment of the Fourth Gospel. They tell us: "As a result of the work of Higher Criticism the Four Gospels are a complete wreck as historical records. It is long since the Fourth Gospel was relegated to the realm of spiritual imagination. . . . They must go on the rubbish heap of the world."

Now the whole board of higher critics might be safely challenged to add ten reputable verses to the Sermon on the Mount, or three appropriate sentences to the "Lord's Prayer." And as to the Fourth Gospel, no man that has known the deep things of God, or is filled with the Spirit will for a moment doubt or question its credibility or authenticity or inspiration. It carries its own evidence to all who have the Spirit of God. We would as soon question our own existence as to question the truth of this Fourth Gospel.

We remember when we were students at Yale going through this Gospel with our beloved teacher, Dr. Timothy Dwight, the noble Greek Exegete, who afterward became president of the university, we were studying the conversation of Jesus in the upper chamber, and were in the seventeenth chapter. A death occurred in Dr. Dwight's family. When he met the class the next time he said to us: "Young gentlemen, you know that in our home we have just passed through an experience that brings men's souls face to face with eternal realities, and clarifies the spiritual vision. We have been made to feel afresh the preciousness of this Scripture, as the most deeply spiritual passage in all the world's literature. Thought can go no deeper, and be within the reach of human comprehension."

We reverently say, "Amen!" The Fourth Gospel is no creature of fiction, and no earth-born child. It passes unchallenged with those who have the experience for which Jesus prayed in His great Intercessory Prayer. From our very heart we pity the poor critics so dead and blind to spiritual things that they can coolly cut to pieces the Fourth Gospel, and callously carry the mutilated remains "to the dump-heap of the world."

The destructive higher criticism, in its animating purpose, and spirit, and arguments, and conclusions wickedly reflects on the holiness of God, and only spiritually blind men could fail to see it. It is simply a historical fact that God has used the Bible above all other books ever written to uplift the nations and cure mankind of its sin and woe. Uncounted millions of martyrs have given their lives for their faith in the Son of God whom it reveals, and millions more would do it if necessary. The atoning death of this Divine Savior has been the truth of the Bible that God has most used to draw men unto Him. But these blind critics have taken the crown of glory from the brow of Jesus, made Him a fanatic, or an impostor and a deceiver of men. They have reduced the whole Bible to a compilation of forgeries, and fictions, and artful stories, invented to deceive the world. And then we are asked to believe that the holy God has set His seal upon this Book,-this concoction of fiction and falsehood, and used it to teach all men to hate sin, and love Him, and practice righteousness!! Such a theory makes God Himself an endorser of iniquity, and the arch-deceiver of mankind. This is some more critical idiocy!

I know we are told that what would be fraud in the modern Christian world was no fraud in ancient Israel and its ideas of morality; but what about the immutable God, under whose inspiration, if we are to believe Christ and His Apostles, the law was given to Israel? These critics seem to be singularly blind, or utterly indifferent to the fact that their theories involve the honor of God and His holy Son.

Moreover the method of these critics who boast so much of their science, is "essentially vicious," and "unscientific, unhistorical and unscholarly." They reject a world of evidence that is

notoriously and increasingly against them, and build on assumptions and foregone conclusions. Nothing could be more unscientific, or more fatal to their own ultimate reputation. Archaeological discovery is burying them in confusion and defeat deeper than the ancient cities were buried. It is entirely unfavorable to the assumptions of the critics and all their infidel conclusions. The exhumed documents of other nations prove the truth of our Bible. Against all this corroborative testimony what have the critics to offer but some linguistic arguments, which other lifelong Hebrew scholars, quite equal to themselves in linguistic knowledge, utterly scout as mere speculations, often of infidel minds.

Still further, there is one tremendous fact to which these critics conveniently shut their eyes,-the doctrines and traditions of the church of the Living God for three millenniums, guided by its divine Founder and the Spirit of God, yea, the Church of God itself is a tremendous fact, the greatest and most potential fact of all human history,-precisely the one thing for which God created our race and is managing the history of this world. The Son of His glory is the Head, of which His Church is the body. The New Testament gives us the artless record of the life and words of this Divine Person,-the Son of God and the Savior of the world. The value and the greatness of the Bible are in this life that it discloses to us. It is upon Jesus that the whole Bible turns. The Book that reveals to us Jesus and His salvation is not to be compared with any other book on earth for preciousness. It is the one Book that we all ought to know by heart. The Old Testament shows us the way preparing over the mountains, and across the morasses of sinful years, by which the swift feet of the messengers approach, that tell of His coming. The New Testament lifts the veil and bids us, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." The worth of the Bible is that it helps us to see Him, and know Him and build our lives into Him,-becoming the Church of God, against which the gates of Hell shall not prevail!

Now such an august institution must be accounted for. This Bible has revealed Christ to us, and that great body of doctrines, which have been the inspiration in life and the comfort in death of millions of the noblest of mankind, which have been witnessed to by saints and martyrs through all ages, and brought a message of hope and healing to all humanity. The idea that such a Book is a composite of fiction and deception, fraud and forgery, and that this Church of God is built on such a foundation of sand, is the wild dream of moral insanity!

We may have seemed harsh in calling these critics "infidels." But the time has come when loyalty to Christ and His Book demands that the real, naked truth should be spoken without any softness of speech and honeyed phrases. In our early ministry we were horrified at the infidelity of Hume and Voltaire, Tom Paine and Ingersoll. But every wretched piece of sophistry, that can be found in their writings, every unfair argument, and vile insinuation and contemptible sneer, or cavil or scoff, can be matched and duplicated, multiplied times in these writings of the destructive critics. If these men are not infidels there never were any. Paine wrote for notoriety and fame. Ingersoll was an infidel for five hundred dollars a night.

They made no pretensions to any thing better. They were just what they claimed to be, professional infidels, like the professional soldiers, who coolly sat down at the foot of the cross, and gambled for Christ's garments. But Paine and Ingersoll were respectable gentlemen, compared with these Judas Iscariots of infidelity who sit in chairs in theological seminaries and stand in Christian pulpits and undermine the faith of men in the Bible and the Son of God. These are they who, under

the fair name of criticism, destroy the confidence of their fellow men in the one Book that can bring them home to heaven, and for thirty paltry pieces of silver, betray the holy Son of God with a kiss. They are the least honorable and the most dangerous infidels the Christian centuries have produced.

A noble physician who reads the Bible in the original languages told us of the pastor of a Congregational Church in California, who was a higher critic. An honest hearted girl came to him with her Bible, and asked him to please mark the texts that she could trust and be guided by. "Such preachers," said the doctor, "are worse than highway robbers." We may add, they are doing more harm, and deserve a deeper damnation!!

James Russell Lowell, when United States Minister, at the Court of St. James, made the following reply at a banquet in London, to those who seem to enjoy robbing mankind of their hopes of religion, and their confidence in the Bible. It is wholesome reading for these clerical infidels: "When the microscopic search of skepticism which has hunted the heavens, and sounded the seas to disprove the existence of the Creator, has turned its attention to human society and has found a place on this planet ten miles square, where a decent man can live in comfort and security, supporting and educating his children unspoiled and unpolluted, a place where age is revered, infancy nourished, manhood respected and womanhood honored-when skepticism can find such a place where the gospel of Christ has not gone and cleared the way, and laid down the foundations and made decency and security possible, it will then be in order for champions of skepticism to move thither and ventilate their views. But so long as these men are dependent upon religion which they discard for every privilege they enjoy, they may well hesitate a little before they seek to rob the Christian of his hope, and humanity of its faith in that Savior, who alone has given to man that hope of life eternal which makes life tolerable and society possible, and robs death of its terrors and the grave of its gloom." Noble words of a noble man, fitly spoken, appropriate now and evermore!

* * * * *

CHAPTER IX -- THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD

Assuming now the existence and personality of God, and that he has made a revelation of himself to the world in an inspired, supernatural Bible, we are prepared to consider what he has told us about His attributes.

"The attributes of God," says Hodge, "are the different modes in which God reveals Himself to His creatures (or to Himself)." "The attributes of God," says Field, "are the qualities or perfections of His nature, which belong to God, not as though they made up His nature, as though His whole being consisted only of the combination of the same, but because they are the forms and outward expressions, in which His Being is revealed and becomes manifest." Dr. Daniel Steele, defines thus: "The attributes of God are the perfections of the Divine Nature, or the different parts of His character. These are called attributes because God attributes them to Himself, and perfections, because they are the several representations of that one perfection which is Himself.

Classification of Attributes.

Here men differ widely, where agreement might be expected.

1. They have been divided into Negative and Positive attributes, that is, those in which something is denied, and those in which something is affirmed of God. To the negative are referred, simplicity, infinity, eternity, immutability. To the positive class are reckoned power, knowledge, holiness, justice, goodness and truth. These two classes are also called absolute and relative, immanent and transient, communicable and incommunicable.

Another principle of classification is derived from the constitution of our own nature. In man there is the substance or essence of the soul, the intellect and the will, hence it is said, we can naturally arrange the attributes of God into essence, intellect and will.

The most common classification is natural and moral. The natural attributes are those qualities which belong to God's existence, as an infinite spirit, without any regard to, or independent of any action of God's will, such as unity, eternity, omnipresence, omniscience, omnipotence, immutability, invisibility and incomprehensibility. The moral attributes are those which involve choice on the part of God, and give Him moral character. As a man does not will to have so much height or weight, but does choose to be good and true; so God does not will to be eternal or omnipotent; but He does will to be just and righteous. The moral attributes are such as Holiness, Righteousness, Justice, Goodness, Love, Mercy and Truth.

Dr. Hodge points out that in the above classification the word "natural" is ambiguous, because the moral attributes are as natural to God as the others; and on the other hand God is infinite in all His moral perfections. Then with true Calvinistic instinct, Dr. Hodge divides along the line of the definition in the catechism. "God is, I. A Spirit. II. He is infinite, eternal and immutable. III. That He is such (1) in His being, (2) in His knowledge and wisdom, (3) in all that belongs to His will; namely,-power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth.

Dr. Miley, thinks these classifications are artificial and unscientific. He thinks the classification should be on the ground of what is most determinate in the subject, which is Personality. "Personality is the most determinate conception of God, and is the only one which immediately gives his attributes. Personality gives all the attributes which are properly such, in distinction from what God is as their subject. A proper analysis gives us the essential powers of the human personality as intellect, sensibility and will; and the same is true of the divine personality." . . . "There is a likeness of powers in the human and divine personalities. Knowledge in God, however, is not an acquisition, but an eternal possession. This profound distinction, requires the use of another term for the expression of the whole truth in God,-the profoundest sense of intellect as a power of knowledge, but omits all implication of a process of acquisition.

"Sensibility is the term used for all forms of divine feeling. The profoundest motives of life arise with the activities of the philosophic and moral reason. Sensibility seems but a poor term for the expression of these higher motives; yet we have no other to take its place. It seems still more inappropriate and insufficient for the expression of the forms of feeling in the mind of God. 'Affection' and 'emotion' are terms too specific and narrow for the present requirement. Even love, while the deepest truth of the divine feeling, it is still necessary to use the term sensibility, but we

use it here in the sense of the higher forms of feeling, particularly the rational and moral, which render man the image of God. These feelings constitute the motives, without which God could have no reason for any action. There could be no divine providence, or personality.

"Will is the third and completing attribute of God's personality. It is the necessary power of personal agency, of rational self-determination. The will is not sufficient for personality, simply as a power of self-energizing for the attainment of the ends of one's impulses and appetences. Such a power is no higher than the self-energizing of an animal. It must be central to the personality, the working power of the rational, personal agency. It is thus the power of election with respect to rational and moral ends, and the executive power whereby one may give effect to his choices."

Dr. Miley's classification can be represented to the eye as follows:

Divine Personality

1. Intellect or Ommscience
2. Divine Sensibility
3. Will or Omnipotence

- (1) Holiness
- (2) Justice
- (3) Love
- (4) Mercy
- (5) Truth

also

Divine Predicables not distinctively attributes

1. Eternity
2. Unity
3. Omnipresence
4. Immutability (See Miley's Theology, Vol. I, pp. 174-221)

This list might be greatly extended by adding, as some theologians do, Invisibility, Incomprehensibility and the like. Dr. Miley is right in his contention that the usual classifications of other authors above given are unscientific. There are divine verities asserted of God in the Bible, which it is a confusion of thought to call attributes. These are worthy of consideration, but should be treated separately. We shall in a measure follow Miley's classification as the best which has fallen under our notice, in this discussion. It would, however, make little difference in discussing most subjects, what order we followed.

I. Omniscience. ' As has been indicated, this term is used, rather than intelligence or intellect, because knowledge in God is not acquired, but is immediate and infinite. The reality of intellect is involved in God's personality, while omniscience expresses the plenitude of its perfection.

DEFINITIONS:

Fairchild: "God is omniscient-the past, present and future, are alike open to His apprehension. We must suppose that there is, to God, some direct beholding of the future, a power which we cannot explain or understand."

Miley: "Omniscience must be God's perfect conception of Himself, and of all things and events, without respect to the time of their existence or occurrence. Any limitation in any particular, must be a limitation in the divine knowledge. Omniscience must be an immediate and eternal knowing."

The knowledge which is not immediate and eternal must be an acquisition. That would require time and a mental process. Such knowledge must be limited. An acquired omniscience, therefore, is not a thinkable possibility. Hence we must either admit an immediate and eternal knowing in God, or deny His omniscience. These alternatives are complete and absolute. Such omniscience must be prescient of all futurities, whatever their nature or causality. Future free volitions must be included with events which shall arise from necessary causes. I I. Vol. I, p. 180

Scripture teaches such omniscience. Psalm 139: 1-6: "O Jehovah, thou hast searched me and known me. Thou knowest my downsitting and my uprising. Thou understandest my thoughts afar off. Thou searchest out my path, and my lying down. And art acquainted with all my ways. For there is not a word in my tongue but, lo, O Jehovah, thou knowest it altogether. Thou hast beset me behind and before, and laid thy hand upon me. Such knowledge is too wonderful for me. It is high, I cannot attain unto it." 16: "Thine eyes did see mine unformed substance; and in thy book they were all written, even the days that were ordained for me, when as yet there was none of them." In other words, there is nothing in the life of man, nothing in his deeds or words, nothing in his most secret thoughts and feelings which is not perfectly known to God. This is the truth respecting all the multitudes of the race. Only an immediate and absolute knowing is equal to such knowledge.

Other passages might be given. Psalm 147: 5: "His understanding is infinite." Prov. 15: 3: "The eyes of Jehovah are in every place, keeping watch upon the evil and the good." Heb. 4: 13: "All things are naked and laid open before the eyes of him with whom we have to do." This divine knowledge anticipates the future. Isaiah 42: 9: "New things do I declare; before they spring forth I tell you of them." These texts reveal the infinite plenitude of divine knowledge, in the sense that all things, present, past and future, are manifest to the open vision of God.

ERRORS CONCERNING OMNISCIENCE.

1. There is the Calvinistic doctrine that God can only foreknow future events by causing them. Says Calvin: "Since God foresees future events only in consequence of His decree that they shall happen, it is useless to contend about foreknowledge, while it is evident that all things come to pass rather by ordination and decree." "It is a horrible decree, I confess; but no one can deny that God foreknew the future fate of men before He created; and that he did foreknow it because it was appointed by His own decree."

This is the primal error of Calvinism. Some features of it we shall consider under "Freedom of the Will." But we will observe here, (1) It is a sheer assumption, utterly unwarranted, that God cannot

foreknow a future deed of a person, unless He "foreordains it," and "effects it by his providence." (2) This being granted, God would logically be responsible for all the sin of the universe, and (3) His omniscience would be impossible. If God's knowledge depended upon His decree; then before He decreed, He would have been so unfortunate as not to know anything. Moreover, if God is dependent upon any machinery of foreordination, or endless chain of causes, for His knowledge of future events, then He is reduced to the level of a finite being, who must acquire knowledge of the future by starting the necessitating forces that produce the future events to be known. In such event, there would be neither omniscience nor an infinite God. The principle of Calvinism is therefore untenable which grounds the prescience of God in His decrees, and denies the contingency of foreknown events. Omniscience is a part of God's essential and necessary nature, as eternal as Himself; it antedates all decrees. God had His nature before He used it in saying "Let there be light."

We may conclude, then, that God does know all the future contingent free choices of moral beings, and to His omniscience it is perfectly certain, what they will choose and do. But how He has such an "intuitive, direct beholding of the future, we cannot comprehend, simply because, in our finiteness we cannot comprehend omniscience, any more than we can comprehend any other infinite attribute,

2. There is a notion, which has been held by Adam Clarke and others, that God had a voluntary nescience; that is, that some future free volitions He withheld Himself from knowing. But this again would be to substitute for omniscience simply a faculty for the acquisition of knowledge. An immediate and eternal knowing would be thus precluded. "Moreover, a voluntary nescience in God must imply a knowledge of the things He chooses not to know" (Miley).

3. Some deny omniscience altogether as contradictory to human freedom. But this is unphilosophical. There must be a God; and if there is a God, then omniscience is an essential element of His being, or personality. God must foreknow His own future volitions, and they are still free; and so can he foreknow man's contingent volitions. "If future free volitions are unknowable because free, or for any other reason, then such volitions are as completely beyond the reach of His prescience as the future free volitions of men. If he cannot foreknow our free volitions neither can he foreknow His own." And it would follow that there is, and can be, no omniscience, and no infinite personality.

4. Some deny freedom as contradictory to omniscience. But the mere knowledge of God influences nothing, nor changes the nature of future human choices in anyway; for the simple reason that it is knowledge, and not influence, nor causation. It was known by God as certain a million ages ago just how A. B. would make a free choice this afternoon. He knows that he was free in making it, and might have made it otherwise. But if he had, God would have foreknown it the other way. The foreknowledge of God takes its form from man's free choice, and not the free choice from the foreknowledge. What a man freely did this afternoon, decided what his onlooking neighbors saw him do: it also decided what God foresaw him do. How God thus foreknows the future free decisions of men is a mystery, like the other infinite facts of His nature. "For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are My ways higher than your ways and My thoughts, than your thoughts."

5. Another argument against the prescience of future free volitions is brought from their present nihilism. We once heard a metaphysical preacher declare that God could not foreknow a nonentity. Now all future thoughts and volitions are as yet nonentities; and if this is true, the future moral universe God practically knows nothing about. Such a notion is utterly inconsistent with omniscience, as revealed in the Scripture, and all sound philosophy. The prophecies, also, so specific in facts, uttered often hundreds of years before the events, could not have come to pass so literally unless God had foreknown the future thoughts and purposes and plans and deeds of men.

6. Others think there is some difficulty in accepting the doctrine of omniscience because it is not easy to adjust it to the divine personality and personal agency. But free agency and personal agency are different terms for the same reality. "If free agency falls," says Miley, "by the logic of foreknowledge, personality must fall with it, and the divine personality no less than the human. There can be no true personality or personal agency except in freedom. The necessary freedom is the freedom of choice. For the freedom of choice there must be the eligibility of ends, for motives to choice. Can there be such eligibility of ends for an omniscient mind? This question concerns the consistency of omniscience and freedom, both being in God Himself.

It might be asked, if God foreknows all things would not His motive state be forever the same? It might seem so to our apprehension, and lead us to think of Him as in an "eternally fixed and changeless mental state." But we know from God's own testimony that it is not true. His divine feelings do change toward us with the change of our conduct toward Him and sin. He praises or blames. He is pleased or displeased. He frowns or smiles according as we live. Our philosophy may not be able to grasp the facts, but the facts remain. There is not in God an eternally changeless emotional state respecting the free subjects of His moral government. Futurities and actualities are not the same to the divine mind. The ministries of providence in the free agency of God, with all the emotional activities of such ministries, must somehow be consistent with foreknowledge.

7. It might throw some light on this subject to notice some distinctions that have been made by scholars about the divine knowledge, originally made by Fonseca and Molina, - Spanish Jesuits.

(1) God's knowledge of Himself is necessary and eternal. (*Scientia Dei Necessaria*.) Personality is unreal without consciousness, which must include self-knowledge. Infinite perfection must imply the absolute plenitude of self-knowledge, all rational and ethical truth must be to him eternal realities,

(2) God's knowledge of the created universe was conditioned on His own free-agency (*Scientia Dei libera*). He might have left it uncreated. As an accomplished reality, it was a knowledge wholly dependent upon His own choice to create.

(3) God's prescience of His own conduct is conditioned on the foreseen free action of men (*Scientia Dei media*). "Granting the reality of our free moral agency, God must adjust the ministries of His government to the manner of our conduct, in the use of freedom. To deny it is to deny free-agency. One man is bad who might have been good, and another good who might have been bad. God's dealings with each, to be wise and good, must be shaped according to our varying conduct, and would be different with a difference of conduct. So what the divine mind foresees about His own conduct is decided by what He foresees in us. The interests of both morality and

religion require the ministries of God's providence, in the constant discrimination of human conduct, the reprehension of the evil, and the loving approval of the good, in the very depths of His moral feeling." 1. Miley, Vol. I, pp. 189, 192.

Turn this question whichever way we will, and whatever difficulties of thought may appear, two great related truths must be firmly held,-the omniscience of God and the power of man to make a free rational choice. The evidence of God's omniscience is manifold. We need not speak of the vastness of the material universe, which in all its wonderful creations, even to every atom is known to God. Nor need we dwell upon the higher angelic intelligences whose lives are replete with such vast intensities of interest, but which are all comprehended in the grasp of the infinite mind. "God knows what is in man; all that is in man; all that is in all men. This is what Scriptures declare, and what no theist can question. The knowledge is perfect. It embraces all the springs of action, all the impulses and aims of every life. The knowledge is so complete that God can perfectly adjust His ministries to the exigences of every life; so complete that He can be the perfectly righteous judge of each life. Such knowledge must be immediate and absolute in its mode. Its plenitude can admit no process of acquisition, no conditions of space or time. The future, even in its ethical volitions, must be open to the vision of such absolute knowledge" (Miley, Vol. I, p. 187). "Duration, past and future, is a framework within which all human thinking must be done. There is no such limitation to God's intelligence. There is no succession of thought or logical processes with Him. He sees all truths intuitively. Heb. 4: 13" (Steele's Compend, p. 82).

II. DIVINE SENSIBILITY.

The term sensibility is used to represent all human feelings, even the rational and moral. But there seems to be no better term to apply to the divine feelings. The Heavenly Father has an emotional nature, like His earth-born child. It must be intensely active. Feelings of joy or sorrow, pleasure or pain, approval or disapproval, hate or love must be forever thrilling His infinite personality. There must be a reality of such emotional states in the mind of God as in the mind of man.

A. Proof.

1. Such a sensibility would be a necessity to omniscience. How could the Father know the feelings of His children, if He Himself had never felt. There would be forms of knowledge impossible even to the Divine mind, if it were without sensibility. We are scarcely aware how much the sensibilities aid us in the acquisition of knowledge. In the higher spheres of truth the feelings are necessary to knowledge. What could we know of friendship, patriotism, love, compassion, sympathy, without the stirring of the emotions which they imply or involve? Without the possession of emotions and feelings we could not be made to understand a moral obligation or feel the binding force of a moral law. In short we could not be moral beings at all. There must be such a law also for God's knowledge and personality.

2. The Scriptures from beginning to end are true to this fact. Innumerable passages ascribe feelings to God,-such as abhorrence, grief, disappointment, vexation, indignation, anger, wrath, compassion, pity, affection, hatred, love. This is not merely human language applied to God. If this were so, then we might as well close our Bibles and theologies; for these terms about His holiness and justice and mercy and compassion are utterly misleading, and we know nothing at all about

God. Theologians in their speculations have too long made God an unfeeling marble Jove, or "an apathetic blankness of deism or pantheism."

3. The representation of God as "pure intellect" or action, however well-meaning, is made at the awful price of taking from Him all that makes Him dear to our hearts. "Without emotion God cannot be a person; cannot be a moral being; cannot be the living God or the Heavenly Father for the religious consciousness of a needy, sinsick humanity."

4. While the sensibilities in God and man are alike; yet in some respects they are quite different. God being a Spirit, and not inhabiting a physical body, He does not have the purely physical or animal feelings which are common to man. Some of our experiences have no analogies in the divine mind. Moreover there are agitations of our moral natures and intensities of excitement, and excesses of impulsive emotion and passion which no doubt, are wholly unknown to God.

5. It might be remarked further that there is not a sameness of feeling in God toward all His moral subjects regardless of their character or desert. A famous Unitarian of Boston said something like this: "If God loves Judas Iscariot less than Jesus Christ, He is not the God I want to worship." Such an assertion is blasphemous foolishness. The sensibilities of the Infinite Being must vary with the character of the persons who excite them. The quality of His affections and their intensity must vary inevitably. There is a profound distinction between the evil and the good, which must find expression in the feelings of God. Daniel was "beloved of the Lord," while God was "angry with the wicked every day."

6. Again the divine sensibilities differ according to the nature of the objects which move them.

(1) As taking pleasure in the working of His natural laws, the instincts of animals, the march of the seasons, the succession of seed-time and harvest, the motions of the planets, the marvelous adaptations of parts to each other and the glory of the whole, he must have a rational delight, and feel that rational satisfaction over the work of His hands.

(2) Again, God has filled the universe with beauty. He has put a wonderful sheen in the breast of the dove, and gilded the smallest insect's wing, and kindled prismatic colors in the bosom of the dewdrop and the diamond, and tinted the bosom of the shells of the sea, and the scales of the fish that swim in the deep, and carpeted the earth with flowers, and painted, as no limner can paint, the morning and evening sky. Who can see all this, and not believe that God loves beauty, and has an aesthetic delight in it all, and wishes us to have it too.

(3) Again God has a moral delight. For the creation of an infinite number of angelic and human personalities with their wealth of emotional natures and their unlimited possibilities of joy, their moral apprehension of right and wrong, and their certain bliss or woe, their exalted happiness or consuming shame over their conduct, there was required the activity of moral feeling. The Scriptures freely express the reality of moral feeling in God as He reviews in judgment human conduct. His loving approval of the good, and His indignant condemnation of the bad prove that He possesses a moral sensibility.

THE DIFFERENT MODES OF MORAL SENSIBILITY.

B. The moral feelings of God take on different forms of expression.

1. Holiness. The Bible writers have much to say about the holiness of God. "Who is like unto thee, O Jehovah, among the gods," "Who is like thee, glorious in holiness." (Exodus 15:11.) "Holy and reverend is His name." (Psalm 111:9.) "Holy Father," "O righteous Father." (John 17: 11, 25.) These words were used by Jesus in prayer, expressing His deep sense of the holiness of God. "Who shall not fear, O Lord, and glorify thy name, for thou only art holy?" (Rev. 15:4) "It is written, ye shall be holy for I am holy." (1 Peter 1: 16.) "Holy, holy, holy is Jehovah of hosts." (Isa. 6:3.) "And they have no rest day and night, saying, Holy holy, holy is the Lord God, the Almighty, who was, and who is, and who is to come." (Rev. 4: 8.)

Many other passages might be cited. The Scriptures are one voice on this subject. The critical student will notice that Dr. Steele and many others represent God's holiness as the result of His will and choice, and so is a "moral attribute"; while Dr. Miley makes it an expression or mode of His sensibility—a matter of feeling. Primarily, Dr. Steele is right; but there is a secondary sense in which holiness is also a mode of the divine feeling. Fairchild says: "Holiness in God must be essentially what it is in ourselves, or in any finite being; that is, a condition of will in harmony with righteousness, which is goodness or benevolence,—fidelity to all interests, a will to accomplish the highest good. A distinction is sometimes made between holiness in God and in man. We are told that holiness is an attribute of God's nature—that He is essentially holy, His essence is holiness; while in man it is an attribute of character. It is safe to say there is no clear thought corresponding with these words. A holiness, or virtue, or goodness, that does not lie in choice or in a voluntary attitude in accordance with righteousness, is utterly incomprehensible."¹

1. Fairchild's Theology, p. 23.

Finney says: "Holiness is an attribute of benevolence. This term is used in the Bible as synonymous with moral purity. As a moral attribute of God, it is that peculiarity of His benevolence which secures it against all efforts to obtain its end by other means than those which are morally and perfectly pure. His benevolence aims to secure the happiness of the universe of moral agents, by means of moral law and moral government, and of conformity to His own idea of right. In other words, holiness in God is that quality of His love that secures its universal conformity, in all its efforts and manifestations, to the divine idea of right, as it lies' in eternal development in the infinite Reason. Holiness, or moral harmony of character is, then, an essential attribute of disinterested love. It must be so from the very nature of benevolence.

Holiness of heart or of will, produces a desire or feeling of purity in the sensibility. The feelings become exceedingly alive to the beauty of holiness, and to the hatefulness, and deformity of all spiritual and even physical impurity. This is called the love of holiness. The sensibility becomes ravished with the great love of holiness, and unutterly disgusted with sinfulness."¹

1. Finney's Theology, pp. 177-179.

It will be seen from the above quotations, how holiness, being primarily a matter of the will, reports itself in a state of the sensibilities. Thus the theologians on both sides are, in a measure, justified in their contention, that God's holiness is a result of His will, and also that it is a resulting state of the divine sensibilities. "The holiness of God is not to be regarded simply as a quality of

His nature, or a quiescent state, but as intensely active in His personal agency, particularly in His moral government. In this view holiness is often called righteousness. Hence the righteousness of God is expressed with the same intensity as His holiness. The precepts of moral duty, and the judgment and reward of moral conduct spring from His holiness and fulfill its requirements." There is an activity of moral feeling in holiness, human or divine. "A holy love of the ethically good, and a holy hatred of the ethically evil, are intrinsic to the divine agency in moral government. We can not think them apart. To separate them in thought would be to think of God as apathetically indifferent as between righteousness and sin. So to think of God would be to think of Him as not God, without the proper element of moral feeling. The sense of moral feeling in God is a practical necessity to the common religious consciousness."² It is only the fear of an emotional displeasure in God that can effectively restrain the wayward tendencies of man to evil; only the hope of securing His affectionate approbation can call out our filial trust and loving obedience. 2. Miley, Vol. I, p. 201.

2. THE JUSTICE OF GOD

The justice of God is His holy purpose to deal with moral beings according to their deserts, or, as Dr. Steele defines it, "The disposition to render unto all their dues." Dr. Hodge defines it as: "That attribute of God's nature which is manifested in the punishment of sin." This is, manifestly a partial definition. For holy beings should have justice meted out to them, as well as the sinful. Finney defines it as, "A disposition to treat every moral agent according to his intrinsic desert or merit." "Justice as a feeling or phenomenon of the sensibility, is a feeling that the guilty deserves punishment. Justice is an attribute of benevolence." Miley: "The office of justice is the maintenance of moral government in the highest attainable excellence. The aim is: 1. The prevention or restraint of sin; 2. The protection of rights; 3. The defence of innocence against injury or wrong; 4. The vindication of the government; 5. The vindication of the honor of the Divine Ruler. Justice has no license of departure from the requirements of the divine holiness and righteousness. Indeed justice itself is but a mode of the divine holiness" (Miley, Vol. I, p. 202).

The Scriptures are very explicit about the justice of God. Deut. 32: 4: "His work is perfect: for all His ways are justice. A God of faithfulness and without iniquity." Psalm 89: 14: "Righteousness and justice are the foundation of thy throne." Isaiah 45: 21: "A just God and a Savior; there is none beside me."

It will be noticed from the foregoing definitions that justice is primarily an expression of God's will; and secondarily the term refers to the feeling of God in view of moral conduct.

We may further notice that there are various aspects of God's justice, or ways of expression.

1. Public justice. This is the divine regard to the public interests, and secures the due administration of law for the public good. It is simply divine justice administering government. It will in no case suffer the execution of penalty to be set aside, unless something be done to support the authority of law and the lawgiver, as well as the infliction of law would do. It also secures the due administration of rewards, and looks carefully after the public interests, always insisting that the greater interest shall prevail over the lesser; that private interest shall never set aside a public one of greater value. Public justice is modified in its exercise by the attribute of mercy.

2. Retributive justice. "This consists in a disposition to visit the offender with that punishment which he deserves, because a moral agent should be dealt with according to his deeds."¹ 1, Finney's Theology, pp. 160, 161.

"Justice," says Finney, "is reckoned among the sterner attributes of benevolence; but it is indispensable to the filling up of the entire circle of moral perfections. Although solemn and awful, and sometimes inexpressibly terrific in its exercise, it is nevertheless one of the glorious modifications and manifestations of benevolence. Benevolence without justice would be anything but morally lovely and perfect. Nay, it could not be benevolence. (It would be only weak amiability.) This attribute of benevolence appears conspicuous in the character of God as revealed in His law, in His gospel, and sometimes as indicated most impressively by His providence!

3. Distributive justice. This is divine justice in the judicial ministries of moral government, dealing with men as individual persons. It regards persons as morally good or bad, and rewards or punishes them according to their desert or personal conduct. Sin has intrinsic demerit, and deserves the penalties legislated against it. Demerit is the only ground of just punishment. The demerit must be personal to the subject of the punishment.

4. Punitive justice. This is divine justice considered only in its work of punishing sin. This is that principle of justice, which Calvinists mistakenly suppose Christ satisfied by being punished instead of the sinner. Holy beings are not punished.

5. Remunerative justice. This has respect to obedience and its reward. The law of God requires perfect obedience as the ground of the reward. According to the Calvinistic theory of satisfaction, Christ by His personal obedience, meritoriously fulfilled the law, in behalf of the elect. The Calvinistic theory will be discussed when we consider the atonement.

6. Commutative justice. This has a commercial sense, and is specially concerned with business transactions. God demands the even exchange, or exact due or equivalent of values, whether in money or other commodity. This kind of justice once figured in doctrines of the atonement. It was said that Jesus suffered the identical or equal penalty that elect sinners would have suffered in hell. This theory is now usually abandoned.

We may close this discussion by observing that this justice of God is no mere apathetic mental conception of theologians. It is the intense activity of moral feeling in God. He lovingly approves the righteousness which He rewards with eternal blessedness, and reprobates with infinite displeasure the sin which He visits with the fearful penalty of His law. To the good He says: "God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labor of love." (Heb. 6: 10.) And of the wicked He says: "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness, and unrighteousness of men, who hold down the truth in unrighteousness."¹ There is no more awful expression than "the wrath of the Lamb."² "Thou art not a God that hath pleasure in wickedness . . . thou hatest all workers of iniquity."³ It is a hatred that burns to the deepest hell. 1. Rom. 1: 18, 2. Rev. 6: 16, 3. Psalm 5:4, 5.

3. THE LOVE OF GOD.

One of the most remarkable truths in the whole Bible is expressed in the words: "God is Love." Love in Him is, in all that is essential to its nature, what love is in us. Finney defines it as "Benevolence directed by infinite knowledge in the promotion of the highest good of being." "It is a phenomenon of the will. All the moral attributes of God and all holy beings, are only attributes of benevolence. Benevolence is a term which comprehensively expresses them all. 'God is love.' This term expresses comprehensively God's whole moral character."

This produces a state of the sensibility often expressed by the same term "love." Love may, and often does exist, as every one knows, in the form of a mere feeling or emotion. The term is often used to express the emotion of fondness or attachment, as distinct from a voluntary state of mind, or a choice of the will. This is purely an involuntary state of mind, a phenomenon of the sensibility."⁴ 4. Finney's Theology, pp. 137-140.

The Scriptures have much to say about God's love. "God commendeth His own love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us."⁵ "But God, being rich in mercy for the great love wherewith He loved us."⁶ "God our Father who loved us, and gave us eternal comfort."⁷ "God is love. Herein was the love of God manifested in us, that God hath sent His only begotten Son into the world that we might live through Him" (1 John 4: 8-10 and John 3: 16). ⁵ Rom. 5: 8, 6. Eph. 2:4, 7. ² Thess. 2: 16.

The Bible is saturated with this truth, and our Christianity is an outgrowth of it. Miley well says: "Neither the apathetic God of deism, nor the unconscious God of pantheism, nor the God of agnosticism without any law of self-agency, is the God of the Scriptures. 'God is love.' Any notion of God without love is empty of the most vital content of the true idea. The very plenitude of other perfections, such as infinite knowledge and power and justice, would, in the absence of love, invest them with most fearful terrors -enough, indeed to overwhelm the world in despair. The holiness of God is the implication of love. Neither benevolence nor goodness is possible in any moral sense without love. In all the benefits which God may lavish upon the universe He is truly beneficent only with the motive of love. Holy love is the deepest life of all holy action."¹ 1. Miley, Vol. I, pp. 204, 205.

Objections: We are confronted with the intricate and constant problem of sin and suffering. Answer: While the human mind may not be capable of wholly solving it, yet it gives us no warrant to doubt God's love. It may be proper to remark, though God's love needs no vindication,

1. While some human suffering is unavoidable, most of it is largely our own, fault and might be avoided. God is a moral ruler and men are His free, responsible, sinful subjects. Justice therefore must have its part in the divine administration, and misery must in a general way attend sin. This arrangement is a demand of goodness as the preventive of sin.

2. The interaction of life upon life, inseparable from the intimate relations of humanity, is the source of evil to many. But there is a counter-balancing good to many through the same law. The law of heredity works both good and evil. So far as we can see, it would be wholly good were there no sin.

3. Calvinism throws no light upon the problem by their peculiar theories, of the solidarity of the race, realistic oneness, representative, and federal headship theories, and immediate imputation of Adam's sin to all his posterity. These theories will be considered hereafter. They give no explanation of this great problem of suffering, and darken the subject by words without wisdom. The position is, that all are sinners by participation in the sin of Adam, and that, consequently, the evils of this life, are a just retribution on the ground of that common sin. The Realistic View requires an impossible agency of each individual in the sin of Adam. We did not and could not so exist and act in Adam. The theory mocks the common sense of mankind,-The Representative View holds that Adam represented us in the transaction, and we are justly held responsible for what he did. This mocks our moral sense. Imputed guilt is a delusion.

President Fairchild suggests some lines of argument which are worth recording here. "There is an a priori argument for God's benevolence which furnishes a strong presumption in its favor-an argument from the nature of the case.

1. God being a moral being, His happiness depends on His goodness, as with all moral beings.
2. This fact is infinitely clear to Him and always clear; there can be no bewilderment; no contrary seeming, as to finite beings; no power of the sensibility to make a present good seem to His intelligence what it is not. Hence there is no probable motive or occasion to sin. Sin is possible to God, as possessing sensibility and free will. There is a possible motive to sin; but His infinite, and unchanging and perfect apprehension makes sin, in His case, utterly improbable. This argument affords an extreme presumption in favor of God's benevolence or goodness; and must be held to be conclusive in the absence of contrary evidence.

The a posteriori argument for the benevolence of God must be drawn from experience, from the world as we find it. It seems planned for the promotion of virtue and happiness; and the more thorough our study of nature and of history, the more satisfactory is the evidence of a benevolent purpose. This is seen:

1. In the provision for animal enjoyment.
2. In the creation of moral beings with provision for their virtue and happiness.
3. In the course of human history, sacred and profane,-a providence working for human wellbeing, especially in the work of redemption.
4. The general tendency to a belief in the divine goodness, is proof that there is evidence of it. It is accepted from reason, nature and revelation.
5. The only appearance of evidence against God's goodness, is in the evil of the world, its sin and misery. The atheistic dilemma is familiar to all; either God is not omnipotent and cannot prevent evil, or He is not good and will not. Either alternative is supposed to be fatal to a belief in an infinite and perfect Creator. The dilemma is not a real one; it overlooks entirely the conditions of a moral universe, and the nature of sin and holiness. In creating moral beings, God consents to the existence of beings who are not controlled in their moral action by omnipotence. As to their

existence, they are subjects of His power; He can create or refuse to create. As to their moral character, they must be permitted to determine it for themselves; this character is not the work of omnipotence. The existence of finite moral beings makes sin possible; and the existence of sin leads to misery, as a result and as a necessary motive.

6. There is abundance of evidence that God is earnestly moving to remedy both sin and misery. In revelation, if at all, we find the solution of the problem of sin and misery.

7. The benevolence of God being established, all His attributes can be derived from this as the essence and ground of all His moral excellence. Benevolence expresses the entirety of His moral character, His holiness, justice, mercy, faithfulness and truth are but different aspects of benevolence, exercised in different relations. "God's goodness involves every moral excellence."¹
1. Fairchild's Theology, pp. 24-26.

4. THE MERCY OF GOD.

As a phenomenon of the will, mercy is benevolence seeking the good even of those who deserve evil, when this can be wisely done. It is "ready to forgive," to seek the good of the evil and unthankful, and to pardon, when there is repentance. It is good will toward one who deserves punishment.

Mercy, considered as a feeling or a state of the sensibility, is a desire for the pardon or good of one who deserves punishment. It is only a feeling, or a desire. But it will prompt to action, and lead to an effort to procure pardon, unless wisdom prevents. It may be unwise to show mercy,-a detriment to the public good. In such case, benevolence will forbid the exercise of mercy. It was mercy, guided by wisdom and justice, that prompted to the redemption of our guilty race.

All the attributes of God must act harmoniously, and not in opposition to one another. If mercy is shown to the guilty, it must be in a way that will honor justice, as much as the infliction of the penalty would do it,-hence the atonement.

Mercy as a mere feeling would seek its own gratification, in the pardon of all sinners without repentance or faith, or any regard to public justice or the general good. Indeed, without considering all the attributes of God working together harmoniously, we would be quite in the dark about the goodness of God and the character of His government, the importance of law and the true meaning and spirit of the Gospel.

This is where Universalists and Unitarians stumble and fall into error. They infer that if God is love, he cannot hate sin and sinners. If He is merciful He cannot punish sinners in hell. If He is merciful, He is disposed to show compassion and pardon sin; .therefore there is no need of an atonement. "But," Finney shrewdly asks, "if He can pardon without atonement because He is merciful, why may He not also pardon without waiting for repentance or anything else as a condition of showing mercy? If repentance is necessary why may not other conditions be also? Why may it not be conditioned upon some governmental expedient like the atonement, that will honor public justice, and secure as full and as deep respect for the law as the execution of the penalty would do?" Sure enough! All these fallacious arguments of Uni-

versalists and Unitarians grow out of false views of God's attributes.

The Scriptures have much to say about the mercy of God. "But thou, O Lord, art a God, merciful and gracious" (Psalm 86: 15). "Jehovah is gracious and merciful" (Ps. 111:4). "He will have mercy on him" (Isa. 55: 7). He is "the Father of mercies" (2 Cor. 1: 3). "His tender mercies are over all His works" (Ps. 145: 9). Such passages might be multiplied.

Mercy as an attribute of God inevitably directed the divine intellect to devising ways and means to render the execution of mercy consistent with the other attributes of benevolence. It employed the divine intelligence in devising means to secure the repentance of the sinner, and to remove all the obstacles out of the way of its free and full exercise. It secured the state of feeling, which is also called mercy or compassion, that is so intensely active in the conduct of God. It secured efforts to procure the pardon of sinners, and produced a great yearning of the sensibilities over them, and energetic action to accomplish its end. It moved the Father to give His well-beloved Son, and it led the Son to give Himself to die, to secure the possibility of an offer of pardon to sinners. It is this attribute that moves the Holy Spirit to such mighty and protracted efforts to secure the repentance of sinners. It prompts God to inspire men with the same desire to seek the salvation of the lost. It is a gracious attribute. All its sympathies are sweet, and tender and compassionate as heaven.¹ 1. Finney's Theology, pp. 157-159.

5. THE TRUTH OF GOD.

Truth in God is the conformity of His will to the reality of things. Truth in His statements is conformity of statement to the facts. Truth in divine action is conformity of conduct to the nature and reality of things. Truthfulness is a disposition to conform the conduct to the nature of things. It is willing according to the reality of things. It is willing the true end by the true means, and conforming all the speech and conduct to the reality of things. It wills the good, and truth in the end, and truth in the means.

This state of the divine will produces a corresponding state of the sensibility which is called the love of truth. It consists in the feeling of pleasure that spontaneously rises in the divine sensibility when contemplating or uttering truth.

With God and all true moral natures this veracity is felt to be a profound obligation. It is greatly revered, while falsehood, lying and hypocrisy are greatly abhorred. Thus it will be seen that divine veracity is not only a chosen truthfulness of expression, but also with a holy feeling.

The Scriptures, have much to say of God's truth or truthfulness. "God is not a man that He should lie" (Num. 23: 19). "God, merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abundant in loving-kindness and truth" (Ex. 34: 6). "It is impossible for God to lie" (Heb. 6: 18).

This attribute of God is exceedingly important. It is the ground of our confidence in Him as a moral governor. The moral government of the universe would topple in ruins if the veracity of God should fail. Various contingencies may arise, and unforeseen difficulties and limitations, which may prevent men from keeping their word, however good their intentions. But such can never be

the case with God. With Him no unforeseen contingency can arise. "The word of the Lord endureth forever."

III. Omnipotence.

This is a much abused and misunderstood term. It does not mean, as many suppose, that God can do any conceivable thing.

Strictly speaking, omnipotence means the unlimited power of God to do whatever lies in the realm of power,-whatever is consistent with the other perfections of His own nature, and with the essential nature of things, and does not imply a contradiction, or an absurdity.

The axioms of mathematics are unchangeable. God has no power to alter them. For example, "the whole is greater than any of its parts." "Things that are equal to the same things are equal to each other." "A straight line is the shortest distance between two points." It implies a contradiction to make a thing to be, and not to be at the same time. It is not derogatory to the power of God to say that such things cannot be done by omnipotence, for they lie outside the realm of power.

There are moral axioms as well as mathematical axioms, although they are not so apparent. It is plain that two and two are four, necessarily four, eternally four, and omnipotence cannot make it otherwise. It is equally true, that right is right and wrong is wrong, and God cannot make it otherwise. It is also equally true, that a sinner cannot be compelled to be saved by omnipotence. Salvation and compulsion are contradictory terms. Salvation is the voluntary harmony of the free will to the immutable law of God. This consideration brushes aside as a cobweb the dilemma so popular with universalism. "If God cannot save everybody He is not omnipotent and infinite in goodness; therefore He can and will save everybody." This is only another instance of the shallow thinking of all unbelief. The simple answer is, God does not decide the destiny of moral beings by omnipotence. He can create or refuse to create such beings; but when created, they come by the necessity of the case, under the sway of moral law, and moral influence, instead of physical power or omnipotence. Says Fairchild: "If we regard this as a limitation of omnipotence, we must remember that the limitation is self-imposed, provided for and accepted by God Himself, in giving existence to moral beings. But the clearer thought is, omnipotence can sustain no direct relation to moral action, in the way of determining its character, to prevent sin, or to produce virtue. Such results lie out of the domain of physical power; they cannot be thought of as the result of power on God's part, but of the freewill, the personality which He has given to His creatures." ¹ The physical world God controls by power; but the moral world He influences by motives, which the moral being always has the power to resist. Having once created moral beings, God is under obligation to respect their moral nature. "It is possible that God might, in the exercise of His omnipotence, annihilate a moral being, or suppress His moral agency. Perhaps He could prevent His sin by an excess of restraining motive, but not wisely; and if God should act unwisely His great power to secure righteousness in the moral universe would be lost, and He Himself would fail in righteousness."² 1 and 2. Fairchild's Theology, p. 96.

The Scriptures abundantly affirm the omnipotence of God. "I am the Almighty God" (Gen. 17: 1). "He hath done whatsoever He pleased" (Ps. 115: 3). "My counsel shall stand and I will do all my pleasure" (Ps. 46: 10). "Ah, Lord Jehovah: behold Thou hast made the heavens and the earth by

Thy great power and by thine outstretched arm; there is nothing too hard for Thee" (Jer. 32: 17). "He doeth according to His will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay His hand" \Dan. 4: 35). "With God all things are possible" (Matt. 19: 26).

It may be proper to remark that God's power is the spiritual power of a personal will. How spirit can control matter we do not know; but that it does we cannot doubt. We know it by our own consciousness. We exert an act of will, and move our arms and move physical matter around us. It is a mystery. No more can we explain how God, who is a spiritual being, can handle a physical universe. There must be an immediate power of the will over matter, however unexplainable.

Dr. Miley makes one more valuable observation. "As God is a personal being, He must possess the power and freedom of personal agency. And if personality and personal agency be realities in God, He must freely choose His own ends and determine His own acts. Any sense of His absoluteness preclusive of specific choices and definite acts in time, is contradictory to His personal agency, and therefore to His personality. The assumption (of Calvinism) that knowledge in God must be causally efficient, and immediately cre-. ative or executive, is utterly groundless. With omniscience as an immediate and eternal knowing in God and immediately creative or executive, there could be no personal agency. For God there , could be no rational ends, no eligibility or choice of ends, no pur-I pose or plan. But as a personal being God must freely elect His I own ends, and determine His own acts. His personal will completes lthe power of such agency. Omnipotence is self-sufficient."1 Miley, Vol. I, p. 212.

* * * * *

CHAPTER X -- DIVINE PREDICABLES -- NOT DISTINCTIVELY ATTRIBUTES

Many important truths may be affirmed of God, which do not describe attributes of the divine personality. They are not qualities of the divine essence or being.

I. Eternity. The phrase, "The eternity of God," means that to His existence there was no beginning, and will be no end. In its deepest meaning it affirms "His endless existence in absolute unchangeableness of essence or attribute." As all things were made by Him, He was before all things, and, consequently, there was a time when He dwelt alone, having no society but the mysterious companionship of the Trinity. But there never was a time when He did not exist. And as His existence is not contingent but necessary, it is impossible that He should ever cease to exist. He is simply infinite, personal Being; as He Himself declared "I AM," meaning self-existent and eternal being.

This is clearly asserted in the Scriptures. "From everlasting to everlasting thou art God" (Ps. 90: 2). "Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure; yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end" (Ps. 102: 25-27). "He inhabiteth eternity" (Isa. 52: 15). "Thou art from everlasting" (Ps. 93: 2). "Unto the King, eternal, immortal, invisible" (1 Tim. 1: 17). The Word of God abounds in such declarations.

Of course, the eternity of God is beyond our comprehension, simply because the finite cannot comprehend the infinite. But it is a truth we must firmly hold. "The only alternatives are an absolute Nihilism (the doctrine that no reality exists), or a causeless origination of being in time. Nihilism can never be more than the speculative opinion of a few, because self-consciousness ever gives the reality of self, and is the abiding and effective disproof of Nihilism. The other alternative, a causeless origination of being in time, is absolutely unthinkable. Therefore we must accept the truth of eternal- being. Hence the eternity of God encounters no peculiar difficulty; for there is no more perplexity for thought in the eternity of a personal being than in the eternity of matter or physical force/'1 But the notion of the eternity of matter is absurd and untenable. To suppose matter to be eternal is to suppose it self-existent and independent, having in itself the ground of its own necessary existence. Then it would have existed everywhere alike in all its modes and properties. This we know to be contrary to fact. So we are left with but one tenable view,-the eternity of God,- the self-existent personal being who is the Creator of all things. 1 Miley, Vol. I, pp. 214, 215.

"In the absence of such a personal cause the only alternatives are an infinite series and an uncaused beginning. Neither is thinkable or possible. Reason requires a sufficient cause for a beginning and for the marvelous aggregate of results. God in personality is the only sufficient cause. He must therefore be an eternal personal existence."2 2. Miley, Vol. I, pp. 214, 215.

It is interesting to notice how theologians have philosophized about the eternity of God in their effort to grasp its meaning, e. g., Dr. Charles Hodge: "With God there is no distinction between the present, past, and future; but all things are equally and always present to Him. With Him duration is an eternal now/" 3 Dr. Miley: "The question arises respecting the relation of God to duration, whether He exists in duration or in an eternal now. There is no eternal now. The terms are contradictory. The notion of duration is inseparable from the notion of being. Being must exist in duration. God is the reality of being, and none the less so because of His personality."4 Wakefield: "We are told that the duration of God is a fixed, eternal now, from which all ideas of succession are to be excluded; and we are required to conceive of eternal duration without any reference to past or future time. But the proper abstract idea of duration is simply continuance of being. We must either apply the term duration to the Divine Being in the same sense in which it is applied to creatures, with this difference, that the duration of God is unlimited; or blot it from our creed, as a word to which we can attach no meaning. To say that the duration of God does not admit of past, present, and future, is to impugn the Scriptures; for they speak of Him as the Being, 'which is, and which was, and which is to come.' "5 3. Hodge, Vol. I, p. 385. 4. Miley, Vol. 1, p. 215. 5. Wakefield's Theology, p.

Fairchild: "It is sometimes said that succession of time is not predicable of God: that He fills all time as He fills all space; that all time is present to Him, that His existence is an eternal now. These are words to which in the finite comprehension, there is no corresponding thought. The only now of which we can think, is related to a past and a future. Succession of time is a rational necessity. Time is not an eternal now. Such succession must of necessity pertain to God's being. If God has no past, no future, He has no now. When we have said that God exists from eternity on through eternity, we have said all we are authorized to say- all that is rationally apprehensible."1 1, Fairchild's Theology, p. 19.

The truth seems to be this: all things, past, present, and future stand before the immediate, open vision of omniscience as if they were now; but still He must know things in their true order of succession, as they are related to one another: and there must be a succession of experience in His life as in the life of any finite being.

II. Unity of God. This phrase means, that God stands alone in the universe as independent and eternal being. God is one in perfect simplicity and unchangeableness of being. He is not one of a kind, but the only self-existent, eternal personal Being. His is "an absolute, essential unity." He is "the only God." As He says of Himself, "I am God, and beside Me there is none else." "Jehovah, He is God: there is none else beside Him" (Deut. 4: 35). "Hear, O Israel: Jehovah our God, is one Jehovah" (Deut. 6:4). "See now that I, even I, am He, and there is no God with me" (Deut. 32:39). "O Jehovah, God; for there is none like Thee, neither is there any God beside Thee" (2 Sam. 7: 22). "O Jehovah, the God of Israel, that sittest between the cherubim. Thou art the God, even Thou alone" (2 Kings 19: 15). "Thus saith Jehovah, the King of Israel, and His Redeemer, Jehovah of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last, and beside me there is no God" (Isa. 44: 6). "I am Jehovah, and there is none else; beside me there is no God" (Isa. 45: 5). "The only true God" (John 17: 3). "There is no God but one" (1 Cor. 8: 4). "One God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all" (Eph. 4: 6). "Now unto the King, eternal, immortal, invisible, the only God, be honor and glory forever and ever, Amen" (1 Tim. 1: 17). "God is one" (James 2: 19).

The teaching of Scripture is unmistakable on this point, and God intended that it should be, because polytheism was the perpetual peril of His ancient church. The divine Trinity, whatever it implies, must be consistent with the unity of God's being. This gives us, rationally, Monotheism, as opposed to polytheism, which has taught finite divinities, but no infinite Deity, and has always been so prolific in degradation to humanity.

EVIDENCE OF DIVINE UNITY.

What God has so abundantly declared in His Word needs no proof. But there are some confirming considerations.

1. The metaphysical argument based upon the nature of an infinitely perfect being. The idea of such a being does not admit of there being more than one. There cannot be anything above God or equal to Him, or any one not dependent upon Him. We mean by God an infinite, absolutely perfect being, the uncreated, Creator of all, the first, the greatest, the best. If there were two, having equal perfections, neither could be infinite and absolute. Neither could be absolutely perfect, because it is not so great to have equal perfections with another as to be superior to all other beings. It is, therefore, impossible that there can be more than one infinite absolutely perfect being.

2. There are evidences of divine unity in creation. As St. Peter's Church at Rome bears evidence of the unity of plan of one great master mind, so does this world that God has made. "The elements of physical nature are so few and in such correlation that a few simple laws determine the cosmic order of the earth and the heavens. If the light of this order reveals a divine Creator, it certainly reveals only one. Organic structures are formed upon such a unity of plan and in such a harmony of orders that there must be but one Creator of all. Rational intelligence and moral reason are the

same in all men, and the profoundest reason must determine one divine original in all. The three orders of the physical, the animal and the rational are so diverse that they might seem to point to diverse originals; but they all so blend in man, that in the light of this union it is manifest that there is one, and only one, Creator of all." 1 1, Miley, Vol. I, p. 216.

The universe itself is a system, the parts of which are united together by one common bond, and governed by the same common laws. The one law of gravitation, causes the tides to rise or fall in the sea, the stone to drop toward the earth, the moon to move around it, and all the different planets to revolve around the sun; and it is highly probable that the same attracting influence, acting according to the same rule, reaches to the fixed stars. The planets are all subject to the same vicissitudes of days, and nights, and seasons. The same element of light reaches every planet and every fixed star.

The same truth appears in our own little world. There is a similarity of type in life in all its varied forms. There is a wide resemblance in structure and functions, and senses of animals. Digestion, nutrition and circulation go on in a similar manner in all. The great circulating fluid, the blood, is the life in all. The physical laws of attraction, cohesion, light, heat, electricity, and magnetism are the same everywhere. One atmosphere surrounds our globe, and a uniformity of administration of natural law is observable everywhere upon it. There is nothing anywhere that would suggest divided kingdoms of different gods. The different races of men have common structure and resemblance, and likeness; and the operations and laws of nature are so harmonious that the evidence is overwhelming that the universe is one and its Creator and Ruler is one God.

3. There is no rational requirement of more than one God. The intuitive reason of man demands one God, but not two or more. Polytheism is a shameful perversion of rational thought that springs from a corrupt heart. "It can have no coexistence in any mind that has a correct notion of God. No other God can be admitted to the faith and worship of the soul while in possession of the unperverted notion of the true God. There is no demand for another. The one true God completely satisfies the reason and the heart" (Miley).

III. Omnipresence of God. This term means that God is everywhere present at the same time. "Our idea connected with the affirmation is that there is not a point of infinite space which is beyond the reach of His power or the manifestation of His presence. This relation to space we do not comprehend, but we rationally know it to be a fact" (Fairchild).

"Omnipresence means God's existence everywhere, not by an extension of parts, but by His essential being" (Daniel Steele). Hodge observes: "Theologians are accustomed to distinguish three modes of presence in space. (1) Bodies are in space circumscriptively. They are bounded by it. (2) Spirits are in space definitively. They have an ubi. They are not everywhere, but only somewhere. (3) God is in space repletively. He fills all space. In other words, the limitations of space have no reference to Him. He is not absent from any portion of space, nor more present in one portion than in another. This is not to be understood of extension or diffusion. Extension is a property of matter, and cannot be predicated of God. If extended, He would be capable of division or separation.

"Nor is this omnipresence to be understood as a mere presence in knowledge and power. It is an omnipresence of the divine essence. Otherwise the essence of God would be limited. The doctrine therefore taught by the older Socinians that the essence of God is confined to heaven (wherever that may be) and that He is elsewhere only as to His knowledge and efficiency, is inconsistent with the divine perfections and with the representations of Scripture. As God acts everywhere, He is present everywhere; for, as the theologians say, a being can no more act where he is not, than when he is not. He is not more in one place than in another, but is everywhere equally present."¹ 1. Hodge, Vol. I, pp. 383, 384, 385.

Dr. Miley, on the other hand, makes a long and labored argument against the above and generally accepted view as follows: "The doctrine of an infinite essence of being should be carefully guarded in both thought and expression, lest it become the foundation of pantheism... If we think of God as essentially present in all worlds, we tend to think of His essence as a magnitude reaching all in a mode of extension, and as filling all the interspaces. The notion is utterly inconsistent with pure spirituality of being. If, however, we still assert the essential ubiquity of God, but hold our thought rigidly to the notion of pure spiritual being, we must at once be conscious of an utter incapacity to form any conception of the manner in which He is thus omnipresent.

The real truth is not in the sense of a ubiquitous divine essence. . . . Personal agency is for us the only vital reality of His presence. . . . Neither knowledge nor the energy of will can have any dependence on so alien a quality as extension in spiritual essence and personality. There is an infinite plenitude of personal agency in the omniscience and omnipotence of God. In the plenitude and perfection of these personal attributes God is omnipresent in the truest and deepest sense of the term."² 2. Miley, Vol. I, pp. 218, 219.

What he seems to be saying in a heavy and roundabout way is, that God's personality is confined to one place, and He is omnipresent only in the sense that His knowledge reaches every place and His power can affect every place. He says "we are conscious of an utter incapacity to form any conception of the manner in which He is omnipresent in essence. Nothing could be more inconceivable." But what of it? Of course it is inconceivable, and so are all of God's infinite attributes and predicables. But that does not militate against the truth of them. And further, the idea of the omnipresence of God's essence, is no more difficult for us to comprehend than His own notion of the knowledge and power of God reaching every place without His presence there. At any rate, the theologians are largely against Miley in this contention, and we agree with them. We find our warrant

1. In the Bible. "Behold, heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee; how much less this house that I have builded" (1 Kings 8: 27). "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? Or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven thou art there: If I make my bed in sheol, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me and thy right hand shall uphold me" (Ps. 139: 7-10). "Am I a God at hand, saith Jehovah, and not a God afar off? Can any hide himself in secret places so that I shall not see Him saith Jehovah" (Jer. 23: 23, 24). "The fulness of Him that filleth all in all" (Eph. 1: 23). "The God that made the world and all things therein being Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands... He is not far from each one of us; for in Him we live and move and have our being" (Acts 17: 24-28).

These Scriptures decide the question and each one must judge for himself, on which side they are.

2. On the Work of Creation. It seems to be an evident truth that a being cannot act where it is not. If God made the universe, we would think that He must be in every part of it. As no attribute of God can be separated from His essence, wherever His power is exerted, there must His essence be. Therefore, He must be present wherever His power has been, or is at work.

3. In the Work of Divine Providence. Reason and Scripture both declare that He who made this world and all the shining hosts of heaven, also sustains them. We are not to suppose that after God made the physical universe, He withdrew from it and left it like a perpetual clock to run itself. This would be to suppose that the universe was now independent of its Maker. But "He upholds all things," and "by Him all things consist." What for convenience we call the laws of nature are only the established and uniform modes according to which the power of God is exerted in His providential government of created things. But if God is the preserver of all things as well as their Creator, then, necessarily, he must be present everywhere.

St. Paul said to the Athenians: "In Him we live, and move, and have our being." "If men live in God, then God is in them. If men move in God, then He imparts to them their motion. If men have a being in God, then he sustains their being. By Him the sun shines, the winds blow, the earth is clothed with vegetation, and the tides of the ocean rise and fall. Everywhere He exists in the fulness of perfection. The universe is a magnificent temple erected by His own hands, in which He manifests Himself to His intelligent creatures. The Divine Inhabitant fills it, and every part shines with His glory." 1. Wakefield's Theology, p. 150.

Nor is this pantheism. Wherever in the universe there is evidence of mind, God is there, using the forces of nature and making Himself seen and felt. He is in them all; but, what is more He is over them all and above them all, and essentially different from all, independent of all, and infinitely exalted above all. He inhabits the physical universe, yet He is not matter but a spiritual Being, without form, "Invisible," "whom no man hath seen or can see"; "dwelling in light which no man can approach unto"; and "full of glory." He is the author of life in the blade of grass, and in the microscopic insect that feeds upon it; He also kindles the fires in blazing Arcturus, and begets "the sweet influence of the Pleiades" and fills the spaces beyond the stars. He is the Creator, and preserver, and governor of all things, marshalling the hosts of heaven and "calling them by their names." As the birds float in the air and the fish float in the sea, so are all things surrounded and sustained by this one only omnipresent and ever-adorable God.

IV. The Immutability of God. This refers to the unchangeableness of His nature and moral principles.

1. This great truth is forcibly taught in the Scriptures. It is declared in the august and awe-inspiring words "I am that I am" (Ex. 3: 14). "God is not a man that he should lie; nor the son of man that He should repent" (Num. 23: 19). "The strength of Israel will not lie nor repent" (1 Sam. IS: 29). "Thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end" (Ps. 102: 27). "For I, Jehovah, change not, therefore ye, O sons of Jacob, are not consumed" (Mal. 3:6). "The Father of lights, with whom can be no variation, nor shadow cast by turning" (James 1: 17).

2. Such passages affirm an immutability of nature. Every-thing else is mutable and changing. The rock-ribbed mountains that seem so abiding are being slowly eaten away by the tooth of 'time. Yea "the foundation of the earth, and the heavens shall perish" (Heb. 1: 10, 11). "And the elements shall melt with fervent heat" (2 Pet. 3: 12). "But thou art the same" (Heb. 1: 12).

God's eternity and His immutability are wedded in these pass-ages, which makes the latter all the more precious. As long as God's eternal years endure, so long will He remain unchanged and unchangeable in character and attributes. "As an infinite and absolute Being, self-existent and absolutely independent, God is exalted above all the causes of change, and above the possibility of it. Infinite space and infinite duration cannot change. They must ever be what they are. So God is absolutely immutable in His essence and attributes. He can neither increase nor decrease. He is subject to no process of development, or of self-evolution. His knowledge and power can never be greater or less. He never can be wiser or holier, or more righteous or more merciful than He ever has been and must be. He is no less immutable in His plans and purposes Infinite in wisdom, there can be no error in their conception.

3. This immutability of God gives solid ground for comfort to all the subjects of His government. It assures us that He will govern His creatures without caprice or fickleness, with the steady hand of wisdom, inspired and guided by infinite love. His moral laws will not be altered to meet some unforeseen emergency of His administration. There never can be such a thing. What ever was virtue and goodness in principle in the past, is virtue and goodness now, and will be a million ages hence. Whatever was vice once will always be vice, and whatever God abhorred once He will always abhor. God's character will not change. His loves and His hates will ever remain the same. His omniscience and justice and holiness and love will forever make Him as trustworthy as He ever has been. He will continue to be too wise to make mistakes, too good and just to do us wrong, too loving to forget our interests or be unmindful of our needs. God has manifested His will to men by successive revelations,-the Patriarchal, the Mosaic, and Christian; but the moral principles which gave them vitality and the moral ends which they proposed were the same. Their inner spirit was ever one, showing the Infinite Being to be unchangeable in holiness and mercy and goodness and truth.

4. While God's attributes thus remain the same, the form of their manifestations will vary according to the occasions that call them forth. If His moral subjects sin, He will frown and perhaps punish; if they repent and forsake sin, He will smile and show mercy. This does not prove that God's character has changed but proves the contrary. His character is permanent; but His feelings and His actions must adjust themselves to the changing characters of men.

David said to Solomon: "If thou seek Him, He will be found of thee: but if thou forsake Him, He will cast thee off forever. This was precisely what happened. But it was not God's holiness that changed, but Solomon's character. The immutability of God must not be so interpreted as to conclude that His operations admit no change; or that His feelings admit of no change toward the same creatures under different circumstances. "The Lord loveth he righteous"; but "He is angry with the wicked." Now the man who is "righteous" today may be "wicked" tomorrow; then God's feelings toward Him must change. If they did not, if the love or anger of God toward His moral

subjects did not correspond with their moral character, then God Himself would not be the unchangeable lover of holiness and hater of iniquity which He has Declared Himself to be.

* * * * *

CHAPTER XI -- GOD IN TRINITY

By the Trinity is meant the union of three Divine persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in one Godhead. This great truth cannot be brought down to the level of our perfect comprehension. But it stands on the unshaken foundation of God's revelation of Himself. If a full solution cannot be attained, the facts may be so presented that there will be no contradictory opposition, and nothing will hinder the credibility of the doctrine.

1. We may observe here, at the very outset of this discussion, that we need not at all be disturbed by the Unitarian sneer, at our worshiping "three God's": God is not three in the same sense that He is one. There is only one living, and true God. The Bible, that reveals to us the Trinity, is absolutely opposed to Atheism on the one hand and to Polytheism on the other. Scriptures everywhere assert that Jehovah alone is God. But Trinitarianism is not tritheism. No doctrine can possibly be true that stands clearly opposed to the primal truth of the Bible-the unity of God, which we considered in the previous chapter.

2. The Bible ascribes all divine titles and attributes equally to the Father, Son, and Spirit. The same divine worship is rendered to them. One is as much the object of adoration, praise, prayer, love, or worship, as either of the others. It is no more evident that the Father is God, than that the Son is God, or that the Holy Spirit is God.

3. The terms Father, Son, and Spirit, do not express different relations of God to His creatures. This idea is taught in the phrase, "God our Creator, Preserver, and Benefactor." But the Scripture language is so peculiar that it is difficult to avoid accepting the doctrine of the Trinity if we are intellectually honest.

(1) The Father says "I"; the Son says "I"; the Spirit says "I".

(2) The Father says "Thou" to the Son; and the Son says "Thou" to the Father; and in like manner the Father and Son use the pronouns "He" and "Him" in reference to the Spirit. In John 16 there are seventeen references to the Father, and thirteen to the Spirit, and about sixty to the Son.

(3) The Father loves the Son; the Son loves the Father; the Spirit testifies of the Son; the Father, Son and Spirit are severally subject and object. They act and are acted upon, or are the subjects of action.

4. We thus reach the idea of the tri-personality of the Godhead. A person is one who has intellect, sensibility and will, who can think and feel and will, who can say "I," who can be addressed as "Thou," and who can act, and be the object of action. Putting these facts together, we reach logically some definitions. Dr. Samuel Harris of Yale: "There are three distinctions in the Godhead that answer to our ideas of personality." Dr. Charles Hodge: "The one divine Being

subsists in three persons,-Father, Son, and Spirit." Wakefield: "The Divine nature exists under the personal distinctions of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and that these three have equally, and in common with one another, the nature and perfections of supreme divinity. This appears to be the true, simple doctrine of the Trinity, when stripped of refined and learned distinctions. As to the manner in which three persons are united in the Godhead, it is granted to be incomprehensible: but so is God Himself, as is every attribute of His nature." Miley: "The doctrine of the Trinity asserts the personal distinctions of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and the essential divinity of each."

It will be noticed that these definitions add nothing to the facts. "(1) There is One Divine Being. (2) The Father, Son and Spirit are divine. (3) The Father, Son and Spirit are distinct persons. (4) Attributes being inseparable from substance, the Scriptures, in saying that the Father, Son and Spirit possess the same attributes, say that they are the same in substance; and if the same in substance they are equal in power and glory" (Hodge).

5. But the Scriptures no less plainly teach an order of rank or subordination existing between the different persons of the Trinity. The Father is first; the Son is second; the Spirit is third. The Son is of the Father; the Spirit is of the Father and of the Son. The Father sends the Son; the Father and Son send the Spirit. The Father operates through the Son; and both operate through the Spirit. In respect to official position Jesus could say: "My Father is greater than I." These facts are included in the proposition: "In the Holy Trinity, there is a subordination of the Persons as to the mode of subsistence and operation."

6. There are some things which the Scriptures affirm of the Father, Son and Spirit concurrently or conjointly, as the creation of the world, which is affirmed of each. But some things are affirmed of only one of the three. "The Father preserves all things. The Son upholds all things. The Spirit is the author of life. The Father creates, elects, calls; the Son redeems; the Spirit sanctifies." This is also affirmed of the Father but in another sense, generation belongs exclusively to the Father; filiation belongs only to the Son; and procession is only affirmed of the Spirit.

7. From the foregoing we may conclude that God is one in some senses; and three in others.

Unity in -- 1 Nature, 2 Entity, 3 Essence, 4 Being, 5 Substance 6 Godhead

Trinity in -- 1 Persons, 2 Distinctions, 3 Subsistences, 4 Hypostases

There is no contradiction, therefore in the Unity of nature, or being, or Godhead, and a Trinity of persons in this Godhead or essence. For our reason the mode of the union of the three persons in one essence is a mystery. There is, however, a profound difference between a mystery and a contradiction. A contradiction would be incredible; but a truth may be a mystery and still be thoroughly credible. To say that this doctrine is incomprehensible is to say no more than we are compelled to say about the eternity of God, or the omnipresence of God, or the omniscience of God or a hundred other truths of revelation or science. Yet reason prompts us to accept and act upon these truths every day without question. So should we gladly accept the doctrine of the Trinity. Dr. Bushnell said: "I cannot understand the Trinity; but my heart wants the Father; my heart wants the Son; my heart wants the Holy Spirit; my heart says the Bible has a Trinity for me, and I

mean to hold by my heart." Charles Kingsley said: "My heart demands the Trinity as much as does my reason. If the doctrine of the Trinity be not in the Bible, it ought to be; for the whole Spiritual nature of man cries out for it."

8. "The inter-trinitarian relations are coeval with Godhead. God is not first solitary existence, then power in creation, then love to the created, then pity for the fallen,-these latter being secondary effluences from a God who in the first place is self-centered. On the contrary, God is essential and eternal Love. Love in exercise from eternity has laid the foundations of all that God is to His creatures and especially to man. Hence the bearing of the doctrine of the Trinity upon that of the divine image, 'We are apt to take the word "Father" as metaphorical in its application to God, a metaphor derived from human parentage.' The doctrine of the trinity implies the converse. If there be an eternal Son, there must have been an Eternal Father,-an absolute and essential Fatherhood must belong to Godhead. The most sacred human relationships, therefore, are copies of realities existing in God" (Laidlaw).

In a similar vein. Miley says: "Only the essential divinity of the Son can give the full meaning of the Father's love in the redemption of the world. The sublimest theistic truth of the Scripture, is embodied in this definite reality of the divine Fatherhood. His Fatherly relation to man is a great and grateful truth; but the truth of His Fatherhood most replete with benedictions is given only with the divine Sonship of the Savior." 1. Miley, Vol. 1, p. 224.

9. Let no one suppose for a moment that this is a mere matter of useless speculation, and it is not material whether one accepts the doctrine of the Trinity or not. It is profoundly important. Our knowledge of God is fundamental to religion, and as God's revelations of Himself have moral ends, and are designed to promote piety, and not to excite curiosity, all that He has revealed of His triune nature is for our Spiritual good, and human experience has proved it so. It necessarily affects our views of God as the object of our worship, whether we take the Unitarian or the Trinitarian view. The Trinitarian scheme is essentially connected with the doctrine of the atonement, which depends on the Deity of Christ. It acknowledges the fallen condition of man, the exceeding sinfulness of sin, the inflexible justice of God, and the infinite importance of God's law and government. The Unitarian theory necessarily excludes atonement, regards sin as comparatively a trifle, assumes that God is not strict to punish it, and can arbitrarily set punishment aside without any amends to law or government, or any substitute for penalty. Whether under these lax and easy notions of the law of God and the evil of sin, and such a belittling view of the nature of Christ and His vicarious suffering, morals can have adequate support, and depraved hearts be restrained from disobedience, are points too obvious to need discussion. The one who thinks it makes no difference in the character and life, which view a man takes on this subject, neither knows his Bible nor his God. The God of those who deny the Trinity is not the God of those who worship the Trinity in Unity. The one party or the other worships a being that does not exist; the hopes of one party or the other are doomed to eternal disappointment.

10. The Doctrine of Trinity in the Creeds:

(1) The Nicene Creed (A. D. 325). "We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible; And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father;

by whom all things were made." "And in the Holy Ghost" ("the Lord and giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father, and with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified, who spake by the prophets"). The part in parenthesis was added by the council of Constantinople called for that purpose in A. D. 381.

(2) The Athanasian Creed, of unknown authorship and date, but by unreliable tradition, attributed to Athanasius about 345 A. D., was probably a slow growth coming into its present form, some time after 750 A. D. It is the most critically exact in statement of all the Creeds on this subject and has probably been by far the most influential. We quote from it: "And the Catholic faith is this: "That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the persons, nor dividing the substance. For there is one Person of the Father; another of the Son; and another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all one; the glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal. So the Father is God; the Son is God; and the Holy Ghost is God. And yet there are not three Gods but one God. . . . The Father is made of none; neither created nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone; not made, nor created; but begotten. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son; neither made, nor created, nor begotten; but proceeding. . . . And in this Trinity none is above, or after another. But the whole three persons are co-eternal, and co-equal. So that in all things, as above said: the Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshiped."

It will be observed that these creeds and critical statements of this great doctrine do not give us any reasonable ground for questioning its truth. They do not assert any logical contradiction. They do not affirm that one God is three Gods, or that there are more Gods than one. They expressly affirm that the three personal distinctions are not three separate beings or three Gods. Suppose we grant that we know of nothing in the nature of other spiritual beings quite analogous to the Trinity in the Godhead. Miley well asks: "What shadow of evidence can the mind of man discover that the eternal self-existent God should not subsist in a mode peculiar to Himself, and quite diverse from that of His creatures?" To deny the possibility of a Trinity in the divine nature implies an extravagant pretension to a knowledge of all being which no mortal can possibly possess. A lower animal might as well attempt to decide what the nature of man must be, as for man to set bounds to the mode of God's existence. The wise thing for us to do is to modestly accept and rigidly adhere to what God has revealed to us about Himself. We are not in every respect the measure of God's being. Trinality may be quite consistent with unity in the infinite plenitude of God.

11. The same attributes and predicables and acts are ascribed to each of the three persons without distinction.

(1) Eternity: "The eternal God is thy dwelling-place" (Deut. 33:27). "Of the Son He saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever" (Heb. 1:8). "Through the eternal Spirit offered Himself" (Heb. 9: 14).

(2) Omnipresence: "Do not I fill heaven and earth saith Jehovah" (Jer. 23: 24). "Where two or three are gathered together, there am I in the midst" (Matt. 18: 20). "Whither shall I go from thy spirit" (Ps. 139: 7).

(3) Omniscience: "Thus saith the Lord who maketh these things known from of old" (Acts 15: 18). "Lord thou knowest all things" (John 21: 17). "The Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God" (1 Cor. 2: 10).

(4) Omnipotence: "I am the Almighty God" (Gen. 17: 1). "All authority hath been given unto me, in heaven and on earth" (Matt. 28: 18). "All these worketh the one and the same Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:4-11).

(5) Wisdom: "Wisdom and might are His" (Dan. 2: 20). "In whom are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (Col. 2: 3). "A spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him" (Eph. 1:17).

(6) Inspiration: "Every Scripture inspired of God" (2 Tim. 3: 16). "The Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto" (1 Pet. 1: 11). "Men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit" (2 Peter 1: 21).

(7) Sanctification: "The God of peace Himself sanctify you" (1 Thess. 5: 23). "Jesus, that He might sanctify the people" (Heb. 13: 12). "In sanctification of the Spirit" (1 Pet. 1:2).

(8) Creation: "God created man in His own image" (Gen. 1: 27). "All things were made by Him" (John 1:3). "The Spirit of God hath made me" (Job 33: 4).

These quotations might be multiplied, showing that all divine operations are attributed to the same adorable Trinity. These passages fairly force the doctrine of the Trinity upon us, whether we will or no.

12. Further Scripture proof. While some question the value of the argument, it is urged as valid by very many theologians, that the plural name of Deity is very significant, as if foreshadowing the doctrine of the Trinity. It certainly is a peculiarity of the Hebrew language not found elsewhere. In the first verse of the Bible, the word for God is Elohim which is a plural. It is said to occur 2,500 times in the Old Testament. It is not relied on as sufficient proof for the Trinity. But no one can show that it was not designed by God to intimate a plurality in the Deity, and to prepare the Hebrew mind for the full declaration of this truth which God intended to make.

There was a constant temptation among the patriarchs and Hebrews to revert to the prevailing polytheism, yet God revealed Himself to them by a plural name, when the singular name was better befitting Monotheism. It is not forcing the argument to suggest that God intentionally chose the plural name to foreshadow the future revelation. There must have been a weighty reason in the divine mind for the use of this word naturally so dangerous to faith in God's Unity.

This is corroborated also by the solemn form of benediction in which the Jewish High Priest was commanded to bless the children of Israel. "Jehovah bless thee, and keep thee; Jehovah make His face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee; Jehovah lift His countenance upon thee, and give thee peace" (Numbers 6: 24-27).

In the New Testament: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with you all" (2 Cor. 13: 14). In perfect harmony also is the trine adoration of the Seraphim, seen and heard in Isaiah's vision: "And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy is Jehovah of hosts" (Isa. 6: 3). "Also I heard the voice of the Lord saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?" (eighth verse). Strangely enough, John quotes the ninth verse and applies this to Jesus; and Paul quotes the same and applies it to the Holy Ghost" (John 12:41 and Acts 26:25). Isaiah called Him "Jehovah of Hosts," and the Lord Himself said "us." The man is rash who dares to say that there is no evidence here of the Trinity."

Again, we are to baptize in the name of the "Father and of the Son and of the Spirit" (Matt. 28: 19). And when Jesus was baptized, "The heavens were opened unto Him, and He saw the Spirit of God descending as a dove and coming upon Him; and lo, a voice out of the heavens, saying, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." All three participated in that baptismal ceremony. The Father spoke; the Son was baptized; the Spirit descended. It is evidence of the Trinity to all who are not wilfully blind. With such it is a waste of time to argue.

13. Errors Respecting the Trinity.

(1) Sabellianism. Sabellius was a Presbyter of Ptolemais, Egypt. He was excommunicated A. D. 261. He taught that the Trinity of Godhead was not a trinity of persons, but of manifestations. God is strictly one person: He revealed Himself first as Father; second, He revealed Himself as Son; third, He revealed Himself as Holy Ghost. The same view was held by Schleiermacher, A. D. 1768-1834, and also by Horace Bushnell of Hartford, Conn., A. D. 1802-1876. (See Schaff History of Doc., Vol. II, p. 292). This is the view seemingly held by our dear brother, Dr. Godbey, if we may judge from his illustrations, as follows: "Water is a trinity; solid in ice, liquid in its fluid, and vaporous in the atmosphere. In my evangelistic work, I am book editor in the morning, Bible teacher in the afternoon, and preacher at night; thus I exhibit three distinct characters, and yet I am only one man" '(Theology, p. 15). This would make God only one person in three manifestations. This doctrine preserves the Deity of the Son and the Holy Ghost at the expense of their personality. It is an error nearly as old as Christianity. In spite of the above quotation, we believe it must misrepresent Dr. Godbey's real view.

(2) Arianism. Arius was born at Cyrene, A. D. 250, died A. D. 336. He denied that the Son was co-essential and co-eternal with God. He held that Christ was the greatest created being, but still was less than infinite. Christ's personality is preserved at the expense of His divinity. Arius wrote to Alexander: "We believe in one God alone without birth, alone everlasting, alone unoriginate. We believe that this God gave birth to the Only Begotten Son before eternal periods (times) giving Him a real existence at His own will so as to be unchangeable, God's perfect creature." . . . "Before this generation or creation, He was not."

(3) Socinianism. Lselius Socinus (1525-1562, Siena and ZuLrich) and his nephew Faustus Socinus, born 1539, died 1604, were; the spiritual fathers of Socinianism, now called Unitarianism. They have divided into three parties. First party held that Jesus was a God of an inferior nature; the second party held, like the Arians, that Jesus was the greatest created spirit; the third party held that Jesus was only a man of high moral excellence which we may equal or even excel. The latter idea is predominant now.

(4) Swedenborgianism. Emanuel Swedenborg (1688-1772) held (a) "The Lord Jesus Christ is the Only God; that in Him there is the Trinity of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, the Father being His infinite divine nature or soul; the Son His glorified human nature or divine body, and the Holy Spirit the life proceeding from His divine humanity, (b) That the Father in His eternal humanity descended as the Lord Jesus to the earth, assuming fallen human nature, that in it He might conquer hell and deliver mankind from its influence." ¹ This system, it will be observed, asserts the Supreme Deity of the Son at the expense of the personality of the Father and the Spirit. 1. British Encyclopaedia, Article Swedenborg.

14. Illustrations of the Trinity. We need not try to find any perfect illustration in the realm of moral being. But simple illustrations may show that the doctrine is neither incredible, nor irrational. '

(1) In our own moral being there is the trinity of intellect, sensibility, and will. We say, "I know; I feel; I will;" yet there is but one being.

(2) In our own personality there is a trinity of body, soul and spirit, and we call each by the same name, man.

(3) "God is light." Such is God's own illustration of Himself, and, strangely enough, there is a trinity in a ray of light. We heard the great Tyndal of England lecture some fifty-six years ago on light. He passed a ray of light direct from the sun at mid-day through a glass prism and divided it into the three component rays -the color ray, the heat ray, and the actinic or chemical ray.

The color ray of course produced the colors of the prismatic spectrum, red, orange, yellow, green, blue, indigo and violet, "Now," said the professor, "off about here in the dark is the heat ray whose heat I can measure by a very delicate spirit thermometer." He did it. "Now," said he, "off about here is a chemical ray, which will explode a jar full of very inflammable gas which I have on the platform, as soon as I bring it to the right spot." He lifted the jar to the place, and instantly there was an explosion. Now the whole ray of light may illustrate the essence or being of God. The color ray may represent "The Father" in the Trinity. The heat ray may represent "The Son," and the chemical ray "The Holy Spirit." The color ray is not all there is in a ray of light; nor is the heat ray all, nor is the chemical ray all. It takes all three to make the one ray of light.

So the Father is not all of the Godhead; the Son is not all of the Godhead; the Spirit is not all. It takes the Trinity of Father, Son and Holy Spirit to include all the Unity, or nature, or being of God. The three persons together compose all the unity or Godhead, nature entity, essence, Being substance. But no one of the Trinity alone means all, or includes all that is included by the adorable Trinity.

So we have the Unity of God, and the personal distinctions of Father, Son, and Spirit. We are compelled to have the Trinity for the interpretation and harmony of the Scripture facts. God has revealed to us His unity, and the trinal distinction of divine persons. It is above our reason, but not contrary to it.

There are many illustrations that may be helpful to many, minds, but there is no perfect analogy, and need not be. It is a mystery; but there are mysteries everywhere. "What do we know of cohesive attraction? Or of forces of chemical affinity, or of gravitation, acting across the measureless spaces that separate the stars, and binding all systems in the harmony of the heavens? Or of life in the manifold forms of its working? Or of the power of will which reveals itself in our consciousness?" (Miley). Yet we use all these truths, although mysterious. So, though we understand not all the mysteries of the Trinity, we may bow to Father, Son, and Spirit, and love, serve, and adore.

Doctrine of Sonship.

A. THE SON OF GOD.

1. Sonship. The Sonship of Christ implies the Fatherhood of God. The divine Fatherhood in its deepest sense is purely correlative with the filiation of the Son. In a lower sense it is vastly broader. God is "the Father of Spirits" (Heb. 12: 9), the Father of all souls-whether angels or men-on the ground of Creation. In a higher sense than this, He is our divine Father, and we have Christian sonship through His spiritual regeneration of us. We become in a special sense His spiritual children and the special recipients of His Fatherly love.

There is still another example of the lower sense of the Fatherhood of God and the Filiation of the Son-viz. when the angel announced to Mary the miraculous conception and birth of the holy child who should be called "the son of God." This was the son incarnate, and the filiation included the human and divine nature.

But there is a higher sense in which these terms are used, e. g., when they refer to the eternal Fatherhood of God and the eternal filiation of the Son. There are many passages of Scripture that refer to this unique fact. Jesus is declared to be "the only Begotten of the Father," "The Only Begotten Son," "The Only Begotten Son of God." God is "Our Father" by creation: He is the Father of the Only Begotten by Generation. "The distinction of the Son from the created universe is profound. His existence is, not by creation, but by generation, and before all created existences. Not only is He distinguished from all creatures in the mode of His own existence, but is Himself the Author of all creation." The Son is begotten of God before creation and time. This is revealed in Scripture but without explanation.

The ancient creeds were true to Scripture facts: Nicene Creed: "The Only begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds: God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father."

Athanasian Creed: "The Son is the Father alone; not made nor created; but begotten ... of the substance of the Father; begotten before the worlds."

This generation of the Son, like the Trinity, is for us a mystery; but it is a glorious truth. It infinitely exalts Christ, and puts Him in a class by Himself, related to the Father as no other being in the universe can be related. But,

1. "The generation of the Son respects only His personality, and in no sense His nature.
2. The Sonship is eternal, like the Fatherhood, and is not the result of an act of creation in time. There was no temporal and optional generation, but an eternal and necessary activity of the divine nature.
3. The essential being of the Son is neither different in kind nor numerically other than the substance of the Father, but the very same, "homoousion"-consubstantial with the Father "according to the Godhead (Council of Chalcedon)."
4. Yet in the work of redemption, there is a subordination of the Son to the Father, and also in creation and providence. The Father gives the Son, sends the Son, delivers up the Son, prepares a body for His incarnation; and He in filial obedience, fulfills the pleasure of the Father even unto crucifixion, and He finally surrenders the Kingdom to the Father, "that God (the Father) may be all in all."

II. THE DIVINITY OF THE SON

The Trinity and the Deity of Christ are truths of revelation, and the Scriptures are the only authority in Christian doctrine. A brief grouping of the Scripture testimony gives a conclusive argument, against which the most subtle infidelity contends in vain. These proofs may be arranged under four heads-The Divine Titles, The Divine Attributes, The Divine Works, The Divine Worship. All these are ascribed to Jesus Christ, the Only Begotten Son.

1. The Titles (1) He is called God. John 1: 1 and 20: 28; Acts 20: 28; Rom. 9: 5, "God blessed forever"; Col. 2: 9, "In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily"; Phil. 2: 6, "existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped"; 1 Tim. 3: 16, "Great is the mystery of Godliness, He who was manifested in the flesh," etc.; Titus 2: 10, "God our Saviour"; Heb. 1: 8, "of the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever"; 1 John 5: 20, "The Son of God is come. . . . This is the true God."

(2) Those which speak of His other titles, "Alpha and Omega"; Rev. 1: 8, 21: 6, 22: 13; "Immanuel," God with us, Matt. 1:23; "First and Last," Rev. 1:17; "Everlasting Father," Isa. 9: 6; "Mighty God," Isa. 9:6; "Governor," Matt. 2:6; "Holy One," Luke 4: 34; Acts 3: 14; "King of Kings and Lord of Lords," 1 Tim. 6: 15; "Lord of Glory," 1 Cor. 2: 8.

(3) It remains to speak of the various theophanies, when "The Angel of Jehovah" on sundry times appeared to men. Dr. Hodge after a careful review of the subject arrives at this just conclusion: "The angel, who appeared to Hagar, to Abraham, to Moses, to Joshua, to Gideon, and to Manoah, who was called Jehovah, and worshipped as Adonai, who claimed divine homage and exercised divine power, whom the psalmists and prophets set forth as the Son of God, as the Counsellor, the Prince of Peace, the mighty God, and whom they predicted was to be born of a virgin, and to whom every knee should bow and every tongue confess, of things in heaven and things on earth, and things under the earth, is none other than He whom we now recognize and worship as our God and Saviour Jesus Christ. It was the Logos Asarkos whom the Israelites worshipped and obeyed;

and it is the Logos Ensarkos whom we acknowledge as our Lord and God."1 1. Hodge's Theology, Vol. I, p. 490.

Bishop Bull, discussing these Theophanies says, "It was the Son of God, who in former times, under the Old Testament, appeared to holy men, distinguished by the name Jehovah, and honored by them with divine worship... He who appeared and spoke to Moses in the burning bush and on Mt. Sinai, who manifested Himself to Abraham, etc., was the Word, or Son of God. It is, however, certain that He who appeared is called "Jehovah," "I am," "The God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob," titles which clearly are not applicable to any created being, but are peculiar to the true God. This is the reason that the name of Jehovah, and divine worship are given to him who appeared."2 2. Bishop Bull-Nicene Creed, Book I, chap. 1, 20.

2. THE DIVINE ATTRIBUTES AND PEEDICABLES.

(1) His eternity: Isa. 9: 6, "Everlasting Father"; Micah 5: 2, "Whose going forth is from everlasting"; John 1:1, "The Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God"; John 8: 58, "Before Abraham was born I am"; Col. 1: 17, "And he is before all things"; Heb. 13: 8, "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and today and forever"; Rev. 1: 8, "the Lord God, who is, and who was, and who is to come the Almighty."

(2) His omniscience. Rev. 2: 23, "I am he that searches the reins and the hearts"; John 10: 15. "As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father." The infinite depths of such knowledge of the Father is possible only to omniscience. Matt. 9: 4, "Jesus knowing their thoughts"; Mark 2: 8, "Jesus perceiving in his spirit that they so reasoned within, themselves"; John 2: 24, "He knew all men"; John 6: 64, "For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him"; John 16: 30, "Thou knowest all things"; Acts 1: 24, "Thou Lord who lowest the hearts of all men."

The one great opposing text is Mark 13: 32, "But of that day [and hour knoweth no man, no, nor the angels, neither the Son, but the Father." This perplexing passage seems to be a disclaimer of Deity and omniscience even by Jesus Himself. "But," says Field, "It cannot be understood in a sense that contradicts the many passages which explicitly declare that Christ knows all things. Moreover, it is very clear from the whole drift of the discourse that our Lord did know the time of the impending calamities; for, in the same breath, He foretells them with circumstantial exactness, and declares that the present generation, should not pass away until the event should be accomplished. And hence we must seek the explication of the text in that idiomatic use of the word to know, which the Hebrew so often furnishes, and which the evangelist would naturally follow, although he wrote in Greek. To know, this place, appears to bear the sense of the Hebrew conjugation called Hiphil and to signify to make to know-that is, "to declare or reveal." The meaning would then be, that "neither by man nor angel, nor by the Son Himself, was the exact time of that visitation made known or revealed." But the Father Himself would reveal it by His sudden and unlooked for appearance, "which in His own time He shall show." Acts 1:6, 7 seems to confirm this view. There the Savior intimates that He is unable to satisfy their curiosity. Through the centuries no explanation of these words have been entirely satisfactory. It remains perplexing and unexplainable; prat, with so many others, declaring the supreme Deity and omniscience of Christ, without any weakening of faith we hold fast to our confidence in our divine Lord.

(3) His Omnipotence. "The Mighty God" (Isa. 9: 6). "All power is given me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28: 18). "He that cometh from heaven is above all" (John 3: 31). "All things were made by Him" (John 1:2). "By him all things consist" (Col. 1: 16-18). "Upholding all things by the Word of His power" (Heb. 1:3). "The Almighty" (Rev. 1:8). Jesus had absolute power over nature, wrought miracles, fed multitudes with a handful of bread, gave sight to the blind, caused the deaf to hear, hushed the winds and waves, raised the dead. He showed himself to be absolute and omnipotent God.

(4) His Omnipresence. "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. 18: 20). "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world" (Matt. 28: 20). "No one hath ascended into heaven but he that descended out of heaven, even the Son of man who is in heaven" (John 3: 13). These words in the form of a promise, assure us of an everpresent Savior. He seals his assurance with his blessed "amen." "Only an omnipresent Being-omnipresent with the infinite efficiencies of a personal agency-could truthfully assert such facts and give such promises" (Miley).

(5) Immutability. Heb. 1: 10-12, "And Thou, Lord, in the Beginning didst lay the foundation of the earth. And the heavens are the works of thy hands: They shall perish: but thou continuest; And they all shall wax old as doth a garment: And as a mantle shalt thou roll them up. As a garment, and they shall be changed; But thou art the same, And thy years shall not fail." Heb. 13: 8: "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and today, and forever." Be it understood that Jesus had a mutation of state. He was in the form of God, but divested himself of His glory, and took on Him the form of a servant in the likeness of men, and humbled Himself to the death of the Cross, and again He was exalted to infinite glory at the right hand of God. Still, in all this Jesus was immutable. There was mutation in state, but not in nature, or intrinsic attributes or divine personality.

3. DIVINE WORKS ARE ASCRIBED TO CHRIST.

(1) "If there be a maxim that is written clearly, with all the light of its own evidence, upon the human soul, it is this: 'He that made all things is God.'" In how many texts is creation ascribed to the Son of God? "All things were made by him" (John 1:3). "God who created all things" (Eph. 3:9). "For in him were all things created" (Col. 1: 16). "Through whom also he made the worlds" (Heb. 1: 10). "God who made the world and all things therein, He is Lord of heaven and earth" (Acts 17: 24). These works of creation reveal His eternal power and Godhead.

"By thus ascribing the work of creation to the Son, the apostles do not exclude the agency of the Father and the Holy Spirit. They do not break in upon the unity of the Godhead, and separate the essence of Deity, in distinguishing the persons. Creation was the work of the Triune God; but the Son was the immediate and prominent agent, in wielding the threefold energy of the whole Divine Nature" (Watson's Sermon on Col. 1: 16).

"Should it be objected that Christ created officially, or by delegation, I answer, this is impossible; for as creation requires absolute and unlimited power, or omnipotence, there can be but one creator, because it is impossible that there can be two or more Omnipotents, Infinites, or Eternals. It is, therefore, evident that Creation cannot be effected officially or by delegation for this would

imply a being conferring the office, and delegating such powers; and that the being to whom it was delegated was a dependent being; consequently not unoriginated and eternal; but this the nature of creation proves to be absurd" (Dr. Adam Clarke on Col. 1: 12-17). "And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the work of thine hand." Such a passage tells its own story, and needs no note or comment. God only is equal to such a work.

(2) Providential Control. Luke 10: 22, "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father." John 3:35, "The Father loveth the Son, and, hath given all things into his hand." John 17:2, "Thou gavest him authority over all flesh." Acts 10: 36. "Jesus Christ (He is Lord of all)." Rom. 14: 9, "Christ died and lived again, that He might be Lord of both the dead and the living." Eph. 1: 22, "He put all things in subjection under His feet, and gave Him to be head over all things." Col. 1:17, "In Him all things consist." Heb. 1: 3, "Upholding all things by the word of His power." Rev. 17: 14, "He is Lord of lords, and King of Kings," and 19: 16.

In these passages, the providence of the Son in the preservation of all things is classed with His work in their creation. "Upholding all things by the word of his power," signifies a personal agency of INFINITE EFFICIENCY His Almighty providence is a proof of his Deity.

(3) HE FORGIVES SINS. The Scriptures teach and imply that God only can forgive sin. Yet Christ forgave sin in the deepest sense of divine forgiveness. Matt. 9: 2, "Thy sins are forgiven." Mark 2: 5, "Son, thy sins are forgiven." Col. 3: 13, "Even as the I Lord forgave you, so also do ye."

(4) He will bring to an end the present system. Heb. 1: 10-12; "As a mantle shalt thou roll them up, As a garment, and they shall I be changed." Rev. 21: 5, "Behold, I make all things new." Who but God can destroy and renew this world?

(5) He is to resurrect the dead and judge the world. John 5: 28, "The hour cometh that all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth."

John 5: 22,23, "Neither doth the Father judge any man, but he hath given all judgment unto the Son, That all may honor the Son even as they honor the Father." Phil. 3: 30, 31, "We wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, conformed unto the body of His glory." Matt. 25: 31, 32, "But when the Son of man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit on the throne of His glory, and before him shall be gathered all the nations," etc. Acts 10: 42, "This is He who is ordained of God to be the Judge of the living and the dead." Acts 17: 31, "He hath appointed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness, by the man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance-in that he hath raised Him from the dead." 2 Tim. 4: 1, "Christ Jesus, who shall judge the living and the dead."

Now the resurrection of the dead is so great a work that human philosophy pronounces it an impossibility. The sacred writers only fall back on the infinite power of God for the possibility of it. Yet they declare that Christ by his own power shall raise the dead. It is equal to affirming that Christ possesses the infinite efficiency of God.

Then this same Christ knows enough to judge all the countless billions of our race. He must know perfectly every hidden thought and feeling, and motive and aim of every human being from Adam till the last hour of time. Who but God is sufficient for these things?

4. Christ is worshipped. The worship of Christ was the distinguishing peculiarity of the New Testament saints. They gave Him such worship as could not be innocently given to any other being but God. Many texts show that He received such supreme worship as could not be given to any but God without idolatry. Jesus claimed it, received it, and God honored it, and blessed those who rendered it.

(1) Acts 2: 21, "It shall come to pass that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." 1 Cor. 1: 2, "Called to be saints, with all that call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in every place, their Lord and ours. . . . Peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." Rom. 10: 12, 13, "The same Lord is Lord of all and rich unto all that call upon Him, for whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." Thus salvation is sought of Him.

(2) It pleased God. John 5: 22, "The Father judgeth no man, but He hath given all judgment unto the Son; that all may honor the Son even as they honor the Father. He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father that sent Him."

(3) Inspired Apostles and Saints worshipped Him. Luke 24: 32, "And they worshipped him and returned to Jerusalem with great joy." Acts 7: 59, "And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God and saying, Lord Jesus receive my spirit." 1 Thess. 3: 11-13, "Now may our God and Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ direct our way unto you," also 2 Thess. 2: 16, 17. "Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself and God our Father . . . comfort your hearts, and establish them in every good work." Christ is exalted and enthroned in supreme lordship and worshipfulness over saints and angels. He is seated on the right hand of God, far above all principalities and powers, while all are made subject to Him (Eph. 1: 20-23). To Him is given a name that is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and every tongue should confess that He is Lord (Phil. 2: 9-11). As this homage is claimed of God, and due to Him solely because He is God, Christ must be truly divine. If Christ is not supremely worshipful then Christianity becomes as vast a system of idolatry as the earth ever had.

(4) He is worshipped by angels. Heb, 1: 6, "And let all the angels of God worship him." Rev. S: 11, 12, "And I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne . . . saying, Worthy is the Lamb that hath been slain to receive the power, and riches, and wisdom, and might, and honor, and glory and blessing." This occurred in heaven in vision and will occur in reality.

(5) He is to be worshipped by every creature in the universe. Phil. 2: 10, "God hath given Him a name that is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Rev. S: 13, 14, "And every created thing . . . heard I saying, Unto Him that sitteth on the throne and unto the Lamb be the blessing, and the honor, and the glory, and the dominion forever." If the Son is not supremely worshipped here, neither is the Father. But they do receive the same divine honor: and it is proof that they have the same nature and divinity. After reading all these passages together, who can fail to see that they

represent t Christ as a Being occupying the same throne with the Father and receiving with Him the same unqualified adoration and everlasting praise? The Scriptural evidence of the eternal deity and glory of Christ is certainly complete. Hon. W. E. Gladstone wrote to an inquiring young man: "All I write, all I think, all I hope, is based on the Divinity (deity) of our Lord, the one central hope of our poor wayward race."

B. THE HOLY SPIRIT.

The doctrine of The Trinity involves the Personality and the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. The Scriptural testimony to both is clear and sure.

The conclusive proof of the distinct personality and essential Deity of the Son, prepares the way for the proof of the distinct personality and essential Deity of the Holy Spirit. The same objections have been made against both, and the Scriptures have prevailed. The objections have proved powerless in the face of overwhelming truth.

I. THE PERSONALITY OF THE SPIRIT.

A person, in the common thought of men is a being possessing intellect, sensibility, and. free will. The Socinians have taught that the Holy Spirit is only a Divine attribute, energy, or influence. This is the opinion of all modern Unitarians, Rationalists, and at least one body of people calling themselves Christians. Against all such, Orthodox Christians contend for the real personality of the Holy Spirit.

1. The personal pronouns are applied to him. Thus, John 14: 16, "I will pray the Father and He shall give you another Comforter that He may abide with you forever." Verse 17, ". . .the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive for it beholdeth Him not neither knoweth Him: but ye know Him, for He dwelleth with you and shall be in you." Verse 26, "But the Comforter, the Holy Spirit whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things." John 15: 26, "But when the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you from the Father, the Spirit of truth . . . He shall bear witness of me." John 16: 7, "If I depart I will send Him unto you." Verse 14, "He shall glorify me." Verse 15, "Therefore said I that He taketh of mine and shall declare it unto you."

Now the Greek noun translated Spirit is in the neuter gender, but the pronouns are in the masculine gender. We cannot suppose this violation of grammatical propriety was merely accidental. It doubtless had a meaning, being designed to teach the distinct personality of the Spirit.

2. Personal qualities are ascribed to Him. Such as active intelligence, 1 Cor. 2: 10, 11, "But unto us God revealed them through the Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man which is in him? Even so the things of God none knoweth, save the Spirit of God." Volition, 1 Cor. 12, 11, "But, all of these worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one severally even as He will." Acts 15: 28, "For it seemed good to the Holy Spirit, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things." Personal Capability of being resisted, Acts 7:51, "Ye do always resist the Holy Spirit"; Grieved, Isaiah 63: 10, "They rebelled and grieved His holy Spirit." Eph. 4:30, "And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God." Blasphemed against (Matt. 12:31, 32), "Every sin and

blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven." Lied to (Acts 5: 3), "Why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Spirit?" Try or tempt (Acts 5: 9), "Ye have agreed together to try the Spirit."

3. Personal Acts are ascribed to Him. He strives (Gen. 6: 3). He speaks (John 16: 13; Acts 10: 19, 8: 29). He guides (John 16: 13). He intercedes (Rom. 8: 26). He works miracles (Rom. 15: 19). He sanctifies (1 Cor. 6: 11; Rom. 15: 16). He calls and sends forth messengers (Acts 13: 2-4), "The Holy Spirit said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." He distributes gifts (1 Cor. 12: 11). He seals (Eph. 1: 13), "Ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise" (Eph. 4: 30), "And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption." He witnesses to our adoption. (Rom. 8: 16), "The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are children of God." Verse 26, "The Spirit also helpeth our infirmities. . . . The Spirit Himself maketh intercession for us." "The Spirit searches all things, yea the deep things of God" (1 Cor. 2: 10).

Now all these things can be affirmed only of a person. If they do not reveal personality and prove it, then human language can not be made to do it. The very name "Holy Spirit" shows that He is a person possessing the attribute of holiness.

4. Procession is affirmed of the Spirit. As generation respects the personality of the Son, so Procession respects the personality of the Spirit. As the generation of the Son is eternal, so the Procession of the Spirit is not from an optional act of the Father. "That would place the origin of the Spirit in time and contradict His true and essential Divinity. The Procession of the Spirit is from a necessary and eternal activity of the Godhead. Like other truths of the Trinity, it is inexplicable for human thought."

But it is a Scriptural doctrine. The Spirit proceeds from the Father and "from the Son" ("filioque" as the Council of Toledo declared A. D. 589). "But when the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father."

In Rom. 8: 9, He is called "the Spirit of God" and "the Spirit of Christ." The Holy Spirit is as truly the Spirit of the Son as He is the Spirit of the Father. This implies an official subordination to the Son in the essential relations of the Trinity in the Godhead. The Scriptures state the facts, AND WE BELIEVE.

II. DIVINITY OF THE SPIRIT. The argument here is the same as that for the divinity of the Son.

Divine names are given to him. (1) He is called God. 2 Tim. 3: 16 compared with 2 Pet. 1: 21, "Every Scripture inspired of God is profitable." "Men spake from God being moved by the Holy Spirit." (2) Isa. 6: 5-9 compared with Acts 28: 25 show that he is called "Jehovah, of hosts." Also Ex. 17: 7 reads, "They tempted Jehovah" and Heb. 3: 7-9 applies it to the Holy Spirit. Again Jer. 31:31-34, "Saith, Jehovah, I will put my law in their inward parts," etc. This passage is quoted in Heb. 10: 15-18, "And the Holy Spirit beareth witness to us," etc.

2. Divine perfections are ascribed to him. (1) Omnipresence, Ps. 139: 7-10, Rom. 8: 26-27. (2) Omniscience, Isa. 40: 13, 14, "Who hath directed the Spirit of Jehovah, or being his Counsellor,

hath taught him?" This is quoted in Rom. 11: 34 and 1 Cor. 2: 10, 11, "Even so the things of God none knoweth, save the Spirit of God." (3) Omnipotence, 1 Cor. 12: 11, also Rom. 15: 19, "In the power of signs and wonders, in the power of the Holy Spirit." (4) Eternity, Heb. 9: 14, "The Eternal Spirit." Unless the Holy Spirit possesses proper Deity all such language is out of place.

3. Divine works are performed by Him. (1) Creation, Gen. 1: 2, "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." (2) Providential renovation: Ps. 104:30, "Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created, and thou renewest the face of the ground." (3) Regeneration, John 3:5, 6, "Born of the Spirit." Titus 3: 5, "Renewing of the Holy Spirit." (4) The resurrection of the dead. Rom. 8: 11, "But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken your mortal bodies through his Spirit that dwelleth in you." (5) Inspiration, 2 Pet. 1:21, "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." 1 Pet. 1:10, 11, "Concerning which salvation the prophets searched diligently . . . searching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto when He testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ." (6) The saving efficiency of the Gospel is in the power of the Spirit. This is according to the promise of the Father and of Christ. The pouring out of the Spirit brought Pentecost, and this power of the Spirit gives efficacy to the Gospel and brings enlightenment and conviction upon men in all lands, applying the truth with convincing power to the consciences of men. The Spirit renews and sanctifies depraved souls, and restores in them true holiness after the image of God.

4. THE SPIRIT is WORSHIPPED. Isaiah 6: 3-7 describes a vision of the worship of Jehovah in heaven: but in Acts 28: 25-27, it is applied to the Holy Spirit. Rom. 9: 1, "I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience bearing witness with me in the Holy Spirit." "This being an appeal to Christ and to the Holy Spirit, as knowing the Apostle's heart, is of the nature of an oath," (Mac-Knight). "This is one of the most solemn oaths any man can take. He appeals to Christ as the Searcher of hearts that he tells the truth; asserts that his conscience was free from guile in the matter and that the Holy Ghost bore him testimony that what he said was true" (Clarke's Commentary). "The best commentators are agreed that this is a form of solemn protestation, partaking of the nature of an oath" (Bloomfield). Matt. 28: 19, "Baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. 2 Cor. 13: 14, "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with you all." There is profound worship in the service of Baptism. The benediction is an invocation of blessings from the three persons of the Trinity. It involves an adoration of the Spirit, as truly as of the Father and the Son. It is conclusive evidence of the Spirit's Deity. He is of one and the same substance with the Father, and the Son. But there is a sending a mission of the Spirit from both the Father and the Son, and in this appears the subordination of the Holy Spirit: but "it is purely on the ground of procession, and not from any distinction in true and essential divinity" (Miley).

5. Thus the doctrine of the Trinity is amply supported and vindicated. It is not an idle speculation, but the central truth of the Gospel, and fundamental to Christianity.

Without this vitalizing truth, Christianity as we know it, would perish from the earth. The religion of Jesus would shrink into a mere system of morality, like other great religions. There would be no atonement, no true and rational ground for the forgiveness of sin, no regeneration, no sanctification, no witness of the Spirit to our salvation. Christ might be a shrewd and influential teacher, but He

could be neither a good man nor a Saviour from sin. It is through a divine, atoning Saviour that "we have access by one Spirit unto the Father." Around this doctrine cluster all the weightier truths of our faith, and the practical life of our religion. In all the history of the Christian Church through the long centuries the most spiritual, practical, and evangelistic types of Christianity have been born of this doctrine. No such fruits have ever* been produced or can be produced by any antitrinitarian theology. By as much as any religious faith departs from the Trinity, by so> much its votaries lose their power to prevail with God or to cure men of sin, and win them to a life of holiness. Unitarianism plants no missions. It is the potency of the Trinitarian faith that evangelizes the world. In life it is the inspiration and strength and joy, and in death it is the comfort and hope of man.

* * * * *

CHAPTER XII -- GOD IN CREATION

The Universe is a fact. How came it to be? This is a question which has forced itself on the minds of men in all ages. In discussion, this question assumes three forms. (1) Whence came the original inorganic matter of which all things are composed? (2) How did this formless matter ever become organized? (3) Whence came the mind that is united with matter in thinking beings? There is manifestly such a wide difference between them that the creation of matter and the creation of mind become separate questions.

In answering these questions three conflicting theories have been advanced. First, that theory which excludes mind from the causation of the universe; Secondly, those which admit of mind, but only as united with, or included in, matter; Thirdly, the Scriptural view which assumes the existence of an infinite, independent, spiritual Being above matter, who created it in whatever form it appears.

I. THE DIFFERENT THEORIES OF THE ORIGIN OF THE UNIVERSE.

The mindless physical theory. "According to the first hypothesis just mentioned, the primordial condition of the universe was that of universally diffused matter in a highly attenuated state. This matter had the properties or forces, which it now everywhere exhibits; and under the operation of these forces, and in accordance with the laws of heat, motion, etc., not only the great cosmical bodies were formed and arranged themselves in their present harmonious relations, but also all the organisms, vegetable and animal, on this globe and elsewhere, were fashioned and sustained." 1 1. Hodge, Vol. I, pp. 550, 551.

The nebular hypothesis of La Place was the application of this theory to explain the origin of the heavenly bodies. It supposes that all the material of the entire solar system once existed in the condition of a single nebulous mass extending beyond the orbit of the most remote planet. Somehow it began to rotate on an axis, and to gradually cool and contract. As it contracted its speed of rotation increased, and its centrifugal force at length surpassed the attraction of the central mass, when it threw off the exterior portion which revolved independently as an immense zone or ring. This in time formed itself into a separate planet. The repetitions of this process formed all the planets and satellites of our solar system, and, it would be presumed, of all other systems. Some

theorists hold that all this has come about without the power, purpose, plan or guidance of any mind.

II. The theory which assumes intelligence in matter. The absurdity of mindless matter arranging itself in the order and beauty of this world with such manifest purpose and design is too glaring to give rest to our thought. So many, who are not willing to honor God as the creator, have held that there is life and intelligence in matter itself. A bulb has life in itself, and without any superintending help, it will develop into a lily. There is something in an acorn, not external to the acorn itself, which will lead it to produce an oak. That something guides it to take from the sunshine and soil and air and moisture what it needs to grow. That principle of life, that vital force, call it what you will, guides itself and never acts except under favorable conditions in nature. And, physical nature, also having in itself some instinct, in time makes conditions unfavorable and the tree dies.

And this prevails everywhere in the vegetable and animal kingdoms, matter weaving itself into plants and animals of every form and kind, developing genius and species and varieties and variations without end by something akin to intellect, all included in, and inseparable from, itself.

There is another more dualistic form of the theory that represents mind and matter as more distinct from each other but always present, as soul and body are distinct but united in the human body. Those who hold this view, instead of talking about nature producing this and that, speak of the "anima mundi," the soul of the world, etc.

Two remarks may be made about these two theories in common. First, they do not account for the creation of the world or the universe at all. Any one may ask at once, who made this "highly attenuated matter" "diffused through all space"? And who set it a going? And who guided it until it should turn out, in the course of millions of ages, a blade of grass, and a lily, and a horse, and a man? Whence came the organized matter, and whence came life? All these things are utterly unaccounted for. Second, these theories, of course, are atheistic. They leave God out of the problem. There is no personal Creator, not only in nature, but outside of and above nature, to whom we are related as children to a father. But this is the demand of our intuitions. The existence of such a Being is a necessity of our thought, and the truth of it cannot be permanently disbelieved. Any philosophy that denies it is false and short-lived.

III. The Scriptural Doctrine. This is taught in the opening words of the Bible, and in the beginning of the Gospel of John. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth" (Gen. 1:1). "All-things were made through him (the Son) and without him was not anything made that hath been made" (John 1:3).

(1) This Scriptural doctrine means that matter was not eternal, attenuated, and spread through all space. There was a time when it was not; and it was made by the creative word of God.

(2) It was not created out of some other pre-existing substance, but it was created "by the word of God"-ex nihilo., "So what is seen hath not been made out of things which appear" (Heb. 11:3).

(3) It would be a natural inference, that it was not a necessary creation. In a sense, God was free to create or not to create: to create with present materials or with other materials: to create such beings and things as He has created, or other kinds of plants and animals, and beings.

Many unscriptural theories have been held; for there is no notion which speculating minds cannot invent. Men have assumed that matter existed apart from God and independent of His will—a view quite inconsistent with the absolute supremacy of God. Still others, have held that God fashioned the world out of His own substance. All things were a modification of Himself. Sir William Hamilton, even, held that it was impossible to conceive of anything being added to the sum total of existence. When anything new appears we are forced to regard it as something that had previously existed in another form: "We are unable, on the one hand, to conceive nothing becoming something; or, on the other, something becoming nothing." This doctrine the great leaders of the Church have strenuously rejected as inconsistent with the nature of God. It involves the supposition that the substance of the Godhead admits of partition or division; that the attributes of God can be separated from their substance so that part of God can be reduced to mere dead matter. This would destroy the immutability of God.

In reference to the third point, that the creation was voluntary, this is opposed to the doctrine that the universe is a necessary evolution of absolute Being, as a plant is necessarily developed from a seed. Others, regarding God as a spirit, make life and thought essential and co-eternal with Him, and this life and power are of necessity creation. Cousin says: "God's essence consists precisely in His creative power. He cannot but produce; so that the creation ceases to be unintelligible; and God is no more without a world than a world is without God."

Still others assert of God a moral necessity for the creation of sensitive and rational creatures. "God is love; but it is the nature of love to long to communicate itself, and to hold fellowship with others. Therefore God's nature impels Him to call into existence creatures in whom and over whom He can rejoice." There is no doubt truth in the statement that God's love did move Him to create men and angels, but it ought not to be called compulsion.

Still others hold that God's benevolence compels him to create sentient beings whom He can make happy. Again God's gracious inclination ought not to be misnamed compulsion. In the interest of clear thought we must hold that what God is, he eternally was, countless ages before these moral beings were made. If their creation were a necessity why did it not take place before? Man is a recent being.

The Scripture idea is that the Triune God is a self-sufficient Being, capable of finding, in the mysterious Trinity, fellowship and sympathy and love. He needs nothing outside of himself for His own wellbeing or happiness; and the creation of the universe was of His own free-will, without necessity or compulsion.

IMMEDIATE and MEDIATE CREATION

The Scriptural account of creation has never yet been disproved and cannot be. It teaches both an immediate and a mediate creation. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth, And the earth was without form and void: and darkness was upon the face of the deep, and the Spirit of

God moved upon the face of the waters." This passage seems to affirm, first, an IMMEDIATE CREATION of the gross matter of which the physical universe is composed. It was at the beginning shapeless, formless, unorganized. This creation, we may safely say, was instantaneously made by the spoken word of Omnipotent Power, without the aid of any secondary force or cause, or pre-existing substance.

Second, upon this newly created, chaotic mass of matter moved the Spirit of God, gradually transforming it into the beautiful, highly organized cosmos which we now behold. This was a progressive creation in which the creator manifestly, used the known force of nature as secondary causes. This gradual development of unorganized matter into our world, full of beautiful, joyous life is the mediate creation. The first chapter of Genesis after the opening, gives the account of this progressive creation-the production of light; the formation of an atmosphere; the dividing of land and water; the production of the vegetable kingdom; the animals of sea and air; the living creatures of the land; and, then, the being for whom all others were made, MAN. This forming out of pre-existing material is consistent with the Scriptural idea of creation. "And Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." God is our creator, because all things composing us were originated by His will and power.

The above rapid statement of God's method in Creation is not disproved by science. "Many scientists of today are of the opinion expressed by Grove that probably man will never know the ultimate structure of matter" (Cocker). "Chemical analysis most certainly points to an origin of matter, and effectually destroys the idea of an external, self-existent matter, by giving to each of its atoms the essential character, at once, of a manufactured article and a subordinate agent" (Sir John Herschel). "None of the processes of nature, since the time when nature began, have produced the slightest difference in the properties of any molecule. We are therefore unable to ascribe either the existence of the molecules or the identity of their properties to the operation of any of the causes which we call natural. On the other hand, the exact equality of each molecule to all others of the same kind gives it the essential character of a manufactured article, and precludes the idea of its being eternal and self-existent" (Cocker: Theistic Conception of the World, pp. 125, 126).

Now these utterances of science are in perfect harmony with Scripture. "It contains many references to the creative work of God: many sublime descriptions of the greatness of that work, and of the greatness of God in its achievement; much of detail in these descriptions; lofty expressions of His majesty and the absoluteness of His power, of His eternity in distinction from the temporariness of all other existences; but there is never the slightest reference to eternally existing matter which He used in framing the heavens. This total omission is out of all consistency with such an existence" (Miley, Vol. I, p. 286).

"But," some one asks, "is not geology opposed to the Mosaic Account of Creation?" We answer, "No, not necessarily." The word "day" in Scripture often stands for an indefinite period of time. "If the word 'day' in the Mosaic account of creation be used in this sense of a geologic day, there is not only no discrepancy between the Mosaic account of the creation and the assumed facts of geology, but there is a most marvellous coincidence between them" (Hodge).

The cosmogony of modern science teaches that the universe, "the heavens and the earth," was first in a chaotic or gaseous state. We will let Professor Dana of Yale, a prince among scientists speak on this subject: "The process of its development included the following steps: (1) Activity begun,-light an immediate result. (2) The earth made an independent sphere. (3) Outlining of the land and water, determining the earth's general configuration. (4) The idea of life in the lowest plants, and afterwards, if not contemporaneously, in the lowest or systemless animals, or Protozoans. (5) The energizing light of the sun shining on the earth-an essential preliminary to the display of the systems of life. (6) Introduction of the systems of life. (7) Introduction of mammals-the highest order of the vertebrates,-the class afterward to be dignified by including a being of moral and intellectual nature. (8) Introduction of man" (Manual of Geology, p. 743).

Professor Dana further says, "The order of events in the Scripture cosmogony corresponds essentially with that which has been given. There was first a void and formless earth; this was literally true of the heavens and the earth, if they were in the condition of a gaseous fluid. The succession is as follows: 1. Light. 2. The dividing of the waters below from the waters above the earth (the word translated waters may mean fluid). 3. The dividing of the land and water on the earth. 4. Vegetation; which Moses, appreciating the philosophical characteristic of the new creation distinguishing it from previous inorganic substances, defines as that "which had seed in itself." 5. The sun, moon, and stars. 6. The lower animals, those that swarm in the waters, and the creeping and flying species of the land. 7. Beasts of prey ("creeping" here means prowling). 8. Man.

"In this succession, we observe not merely an order of events, like that deduced from science; there is a system in the arrangement, and a far reaching prophecy, to which philosophy could not have attained, however instructed.

"The account recognizes in creation two great eras of three days each,-an Inorganic and an Organic. Each of these three opens with the appearance of light; the first, light cosmical; the second, light from the sun for the special uses of the earth.

"Each era ends in a 'day' of two great works-the two shown to be distinct by being severally pronounced 'good.' On the third day that closes the Inorganic Era, there was first the dividing of the land from the waters, and afterwards the creation of vegetation, or the instituting of a kingdom of life-a work widely diverse from all that preceded it in the era. So on the sixth day, terminating the Organic Era, there was first the creation of mammals, and then a second far greater work, totally new in its grandest element, the creation of man.

"The arrangement is, then, as follows:

I. The Inorganic Era.

1st Day.-Light Cosmical.

2nd Day.-The earth divided from the fluid around it, or individualized.

3rd Day.-1. Outlining of the land and water.

2. Creation of vegetation.

II. The Organic Era.

4th Day.-Light from the Sun.

5th Day.-Creation of the lower order of animals.

6th Day.-1. Creation of mammals.

3. Creation of man.

"The record in the Bible," says Professor Dana, "is therefore profoundly philosophical in the scheme of creation which it presents. It is both true and divine. It is a declaration of authorship, both of creation and the Bible, on the first page of the sacred volume" (Manual of Geology, pp. 745, 746).

Again he says: "The first thought that strikes the scientific reader (of the Mosaic Account) is the evidence of divinity, not merely in the first verse of the record, and the successive fiats, but in the whole order of creation. There is so much that the most recent readings of science have for the first time explained, that the idea of man as the author becomes utterly incomprehensible. By proving the record true, science pronounces it divine; for who could have correctly narrated the secrets of eternity but God himself?" (Bibliotheca Sacra, Jan., 1856, p. 110.) Professor Dana said Professor Guyot's views on the Harmony between Science and the Bible, are the best he had seen. Dr. Hodge pronounces Professor Dana of Yale and Professor Guyot of Princeton, "Scientific naturalists of the first rank, to whom the friends of the Bible owe a debt of gratitude for their vindication of the sacred record." The Bible is of God, and the book of nature is of God; and of course the books, when rightly interpreted, will agree.

Other scientists, proceeding with the sense of geological ages in the days of creation, not only find no contrariety between Genesis and geology, but do find a marvelous accordance in the cardinal facts of the two records. Hugh Miller, eminent in Geology, says: "Now I am greatly mistaken if we have not in the six geological periods, all the elements, without misplacement or exaggeration of, the Mosaic drama of creation. Rightly understood I know not a single scientific truth that militates against even the minutest or least prominent of its details."

Professor Winchell, another distinguished scientist, shows that the upward progress and completion of the world in the Bible and in the rocks is, day for day, substantially the same. Winchell says: "The author of Genesis has given us an account which, when rightly understood, conforms admirably to the indications of latest science."

Dr. Dawson, once president of the British Scientific Association, and of world-wide fame in science, finds, "a parallelism of the Scripture cosmogony with the astronomical and geological history of the earth." After a careful comparison of the two histories he says: "The reader has, I trust, found in the preceding pages, sufficient evidence that the Bible has nothing to dread from the

revelations of geology, but much to hope in the way of elucidation of its meaning and confirmation of its truth."

The late Professor Tait, of Edinburgh, writing in *The International Review*, said: "The assumed incompatibility of religion and science has been so often and confidently asserted in recent times that it has come to be taken for granted by the writers of articles; and it is, of course, perpetually thrust before their too trusting readers. But THE WHOLE THING is A MISTAKE, and a mistake so grave that no truly scientific man runs, in Britain at least, the smallest risk of making it. With a few, and these very singular, exceptions, the truly scientific men and true theologians of the present day have not found themselves under the necessity of quarrelling."

Professor G. J. Romanes has, in his "Thoughts on Religion" left the testimony that he was influenced in his return to faith by the fact that, in his own university of Cambridge, nearly all the men of most eminent scientific attainments were avowed Christians.

Having heard from first class men of science, we will now hear from a Theologian of the first rank, Professor James Orr D. D., of Glasgow, Scotland: "Does science, then, really contradict Genesis 1? Not surely if what has been said above of the essentially popular character of the allusions to natural things in the Bible be remembered. Here certainly is no detailed description of the process of the formation of the earth in terms anticipative of modern science-terms which would have been unintelligible to the original readers-but a sublime picture, true to the order of nature, as it is to the broad facts even of geological succession. If it tells how God called heaven and earth into being, separated light from darkness, sea from land, clothed the world with vegetation, gave sun and moon their appointed rule of day and night, made fowls to fly, and sea monsters to plow the deep, created the cattle and beasts of the field, and finally made man, male and female, in His own image, and established him as ruler over all God's creation, this orderly rise of created forms, man crowning the whole, these deep ideas of the narrative, setting the world at the very beginning in its right relation to God, and laying the foundations of an enduring philosophy of religion, are truths which science does nothing to subvert, but in myriad ways confirms. The six days may remain as a difficulty to some; but, if this is not part of the symbolic setting of the picture-a great "divine 'week' of work-one may well ask, as was done by Augustine long before geology was thought of, what kind of days there were which rolled their course before the sun, with its twenty-four hours of diurnal measurement was appointed to that end. There is no violence done to the narrative in substituting in thought 'aeonic' days-vast cosmic periods -for 'days' on our narrower, sun-measured scale. Then the last trace of apparent 'conflict' disappears."

Miley, discussing the whole question with care, concludes thus: "With the sense of ages for the Mosaic days, which we have found clearly permissible, the reconciliation is complete. Scientists find an accordance between the two records which, beyond the attainment of consistency, proves the divine original of the Mosaic."

IV. EVOLUTION.

"But," says some one, "is not the accepted doctrine of Evolution opposed to this theory of the agreement of the Bible and Science?" Much of the doctrine of evolution, as held by many, is

unquestionably opposed to the Bible. This renders a discussion of Evolution necessary. There are several forms of the theory.

I. Naturalistic or Materialistic Evolution.

This theory counts out all divine agency, and wholly rules out God, from the whole process of the world's formation. It asserts an absolute continuity of the physical forces which began to work in the primordial fire-mist which was their only material; out of it these unaided forces constructed the world, and originated all the forms of life upon it including man. "Such are the assumptions of the theory. They are extravagant enough to perplex the shrewdest and appall the boldest." Fire-mist goes to work of its own accord, forms itself into orderly worlds, and sets them in the harmony of the heavens, as if it were guided by Omniscient mind. Yea, more, it originates life in water and air, in forest and field! Yea, this fire-mist evolves man and invests him with the exalted powers of personality! Fire-mist weaves itself into the legislation of a Moses; sings in the Psalms of David; reasons in the philosophy of Plato; weighs the stars through the brain of a Newton; teaches moral wisdom in the tragedies of Shakespeare; preaches theology in Paul; and, last and highest of all, reveals Divinity in Jesus Christ! All this is the assumption of naturalistic evolution. The potency of the Son of God in a fiery cloud! It is an impudent and Godless philosophy. Even Tyndal was forced to say, "Surely these notions represent an absurdity too monstrous to be entertained by any sane mind."

The theory is beset with insuperable difficulties.

1. Who made the first-mist? "The fire-mist primordial with science, is not primordial with reason.
2. Matter tends to rest. Who started fire-mist in such orderly and constructive motion?
3. Who guided it in its marvellously inventive work?
4. Who bridged the chasm between the lifeless and living matter, by originating life?
Abiogenesis-the origin of living matter from lifeless matter is a necessity of the theory. Of this, even Professor Huxley was obliged to admit, "The fact is, that at the present moment there is not a shadow of trustworthy direct evidence that abiogenesis does now take place, or has taken place within the period during which the existence of life on the globe is recorded."

It was reluctant evidence which he gave: so he did not close the case with that honest statement. He went on after this illogical fashion: "But it need hardly be pointed out that the fact does not in the slightest degree interfere with any conclusion that may be arrived at deductively from other considerations that, at some time or other, abiogenesis **MUST HAVE TAKEN PLACE.**" And how does he prove it? Why, thus, "IF THE HYPOTHESIS of evolution is true, living matter **MUST HAVE** arisen from non-living; for, by the hypothesis, the condition of the globe was at one time such that living matter could not have existed on it. Of the causes which led , to the origination of living matter **WE KNOW ABSOLUTELY NOTHING.**" , (British Encyclopaedia Biology.) In other words Huxley's argument stands thus: "IF" the unproved hypothesis of evolution is true, there "must have been" a spontaneous generation of life: but "**WE KNOW ABSOLUTELY NOTHING ABOUT IT,**" and have not a particle of proof. An unproved assumption, hanging on an "if" is the conditional

premise of his argument, from which he dares to assume a real conclusion, and palm it off on the world as a scientific fact! Such fallacious argument is an insult to real science.

By the same method of argument, and with far more plausibility, we can prove that the moon is made of green cheese. Here is the proof. It is a working hypothesis in everybody's mouth from time immemorial that the moon is made of green cheese. But "if" it is, it "must have been" made of milk, and some one "must have been" big enough to make the cheese. Now there "must have been" plenty of milk, for there are the constellations, Taurus, the bull; Aries, the ram, and Capricornus, the he-goat in the celestial zodiac. They "must have been" attended by vast herds of starry cows, ewes, and nanny-goats. Then there were the constellations, Gemini, the twins to herd them, and Aquarius, the water-man to water them, and Virgo, the milkmaid to milk them (girls always milked). And, finally, there was, in the same neighborhood, the gigantic constellation Orion abundantly able to turn the cheese. Therefore the moon is beyond all question made of green cheese, and anyone who does not believe it is simply not up-to-date in modern thought!

Such reasoning is a short and easy process. Make a hypothesis -a pure assumption; deduce its logical consequence; without any proof, declare it to be a fact in nature; make this imagined reality the proof of your hypothesis: then, with conceited audacity declare you have proved it, and call it "science." Such arguing in a circle proves absolutely nothing, and evolution must be in a desperate predicament to need such support. Such naturalistic evolution is only another form of bald atheism parading in a new dress before the world.

II. Theistic Evolution. Theistic evolution means a divine agency superintending it. There are widely varying opinions as to the degree of the divine superintendence. Some hold to only a few special interpositions, as in the origin of life, and the origin of mind or man. Others hold that the whole development of the world from the fire-mist and the evolution of all species of life were directly superintended by God, and whatever evolution there was in it, was simply God's method of operation.

In such a view, the divine agency was just as real in the origin of new species as it would have been if the species had each originated by a new immediate creation. Each view demands a God of infinite wisdom and power; but the first, which admits as little of Him as possible, "is false to the divine providence and to the true sense of creation" (Miley).

If evolution were proved, which it is not, from the fiery cloud up to man, it would not prove his origin in the same mode. "He is too distinct in his constitution and too high in his grade for any such conclusion." This view is widely accepted. Many evolutionists separate man from all lower orders, and account his origin, particularly in his mental and moral nature, to the creative agency of God.

"In bodily form, in organic structure, in volume of brain, man is so widely separated from all orders, so elevated above all, that his immediate evolution from any known order clearly seems impossible. This may be said in the presence of all the determining principles which underlie the theories of evolution. Man was the same in his earliest existence that he is now. No discovered remains represent him in the beginning as far down the scale in approximation to the ape. Mr. Huxley, after a critical investigation, was compelled to admit that the Engis and Neanderthal

skulls, among the oldest human fossils yet discovered, show that man has not changed. Of the Engis skull, he said: "It is, in fact, a fair average human skull, which might have belonged to a philosopher, or might have contained the thoughtless brains of a savage." The Neanderthal skull represents a man of somewhat lower type, but still a man as widely separated from the ape, as the lower races of the present. He concludes thus: "I may say that the fossil remains of man hitherto discovered, do not seem to me to take us appreciably nearer to that lower pithecoïd form, by the modification of which he HAS PROBABLY become what he is." Dawson confirms the testimony from the study of other fossil remains. The meaning of all this is that the wide separation of living man from the ape is not in the least narrowed by the discovered fossils of man. In other words the evidence is utterly wanting that man sprang from the ape, so far as fossil remains are concerned. There is no pretension to any knowledge of actual instances of such evolution. There are no instances where nature has made as wide a variation by a single bound as that which separates man from the ape.

Men who are inclined to evolution have looked in vain for the missing links which would unite the apes to man. If the theory is true the African and Asiatic woods ought to be full of them. There are millions of monkeys. If they ever did evolve into men, why are they not doing it now? It is very significant that the evidence has not been found for this theory of the evolution of man, and it is brazen impudence to claim it until the evidence is in hand. Says Dana: "No remains of fossil man bear evidence to less perfect erectness of structure than in civilized man, or to any nearer approach to the man-ape in essential characteristics. The existing man-apes belong to lines that reached up to them as their ultimatum; but of that line which is supposed to have reached upward to man, not the first link below the lowest level of existing man has yet been found. This is the more extraordinary in view of the fact that, from the lowest limit in existing man, there are all possible gradations up to the highest; while below that limit there is an abrupt fall to the ape level, in which the cubic capacity of the brain is one half less. If the links ever existed, their annihilation without trace is so extremely improbable that it may be pronounced impossible. Until they are found, science cannot assert that they ever existed."¹ There are other difficulties in the way of the theory. 1. Dana, *Geology*, p. 603.

1. We should not be misled by what we hear about the anthropoid ape, nor lured into the notion that some one family is specially like man. Nor is there an ascending scale of manlikeness through a succession of ape families until higher points of similarity converge in man. Mivart, an eminent scientist, clearly points out that the ape families do not in any order of succession represent a growth of anthropoid quality. Evolutionists disagree as to whether man's ancestor was the Chimpanzee, the Gibbon, the Gorilla, or the Orang. Each has been sent to the rear as an impossible candidate for the great honor. Wallace, studying the question said: "On the whole we find that no one of the great apes can be asserted to be the nearest to man in structure. Each of them approaches him in certain characteristics, while in others it is widely removed, giving the idea that all are derived from a common ancestor, from which the anthropoid apes as well as man have diverged."² 2. Wallace, "Darwinism," pp. 452, 453.

2. In other words the evolutionists have abandoned the ape parentage of man, and are hunting for another which has not been found. There is not a particle of evidence that any more remote ancestor was more anthropoid than the ape. So some more ancestors and missing links must be found to prove the evolution of man. The proof has not yet been found of the evolution of even

man's organic nature, much less of his mind. The evolution of man's mental nature is infinitely more difficult than the evolution of his physical nature. Tyndal, to escape the difficulty, wants a new definition of matter. But the alteration of terms and words would not change facts. Matter cannot be the source of mind.

III. The very theory of evolution has not yet emerged from the hypothetic state. "It is not yet an established science. The diversities of theory among evolutionists deny it a scientific position."¹ Many scientists, their equals and superiors, only make sport of it. The late Professor Virchow, of Berlin, one of the foremost scientists in the world, speaking of some clubs of evolutionists, called them "bubble clubs." Bubbles are unsubstantial, worthless and short lived. 1. Miley, Vol. I, p. 135

It is well to have a brief statement of the past progress, and present decline of this great doctrine, and its most probable fate in the near future, and a statement of the arguments against it.

"Charles Darwin wrote two scientific romances, which he entitled 'The Origin of Species' and the 'Descent of Man,' full of interesting facts and fascinating fiction. The phrase, 'We may well suppose,' or its equivalent, occurs over 800 times in these volumes, and his scientific suppositions were treated almost as established facts. Many men of science took Mr. Darwin too seriously; they were so pleased with the result of his patient investigations that they accepted his romancings and built upon them a philosophy of science which was a scientific apostasy. The effect of his life work on his own mind was not pleasing to Mr. Darwin himself, who was startled to find that he had lost all taste for poetry, music and religion; but to the last he remained very fond of worms, delighting in their ways and works.

The effect of his philosophy of science upon many of his followers was to turn them from the spiritual to the material—from music, poetry and religion to worms! Along this channel, the scientific world turned into a great apostasy, from which, thank God, it is beginning to recover" (A. C. Dixon, "Back to Bible," p. 43).

1. In 1871 Dr. Bastian secured some support for the theory of THE SPONTANEOUS GENERATION OF LIFE. Scientists began to use such terms as "Bathmism," "cosmic ether," "cosmic emotion," "vital fluid," "germ-plasm," "pangenesis," "protoplasm," "growth force," and such like, all showing an eager effort to get rid of God in accounting for life. But the attempt was mournful and short lived. Sir William Thompson speedily surrendered his theory that life germs rode down to this world on meteors from some other planet. Poor Huxley made a flourish of trumpets about his "protoplasm," or "bathybius," or "deep-sea ooze." "He claimed that the whole bed of the ocean was covered with the substratum of all life." His profession of faith was this: "Protoplasm is the origin of all life... It is a molecular machine, all powerful and all sufficient." But the United States sent out the ship Challenger with Professor Murray the scientist on board. He gathered many specimens of this oceanic mud, and by his experiments he demonstrated that seawater and alcohol mingled gave a flocculent precipitate which, separated from the liquid, was identical with Huxley's protoplasm. He showed the experiment to Professor Huxley and the delusion vanished. The all-powerful and all-sufficient protoplasm was merely a precipitated sulphate, which any chemist can make for himself."¹ Thus rudely burst one of the largest bubbles blown by the international "bubble club." 1. Prof. Townsend, "Collapse of Evolution," p. 61.

Herbert Spencer had, likewise, to abandon his theory of the chemical origin of life, and left it out of the last edition of "Biology."

Professor Tyndall, after all his predilections toward evolution, was compelled to write: "I share Virchow's opinion that the theory of evolution, in its complete form involves the assumption that at some period or other of the earth's history there occurred what would now be called spontaneous generation; but I also agree with him that the proofs of it are still wanting. I also hold with Virchow that the failures have been so lamentable that the doctrine is utterly discredited." Yet in the face of such admissions from a scientist of world-wide fame, a professor of Chicago University is reported to have said not long ago to one of his classes: "The divine creation of life is a pure humbug. Life originally happened. Life is made up of certain organic compounds. Certain organic compounds were made by nature. The compounds came together in some matter, and the result was life. I believe that in a short time real life will be created in the laboratory." Was that professor ignorant, or was he simply spouting out the miserable infidelity of his carnal heart?

At any rate, a professor of Boston University said of it: "For a man who professes to be a scientist to employ such language is surprising and almost incredible. Here is nothing but dogmatic assertion, of which a canting clergyman, or mountebank, not to say scientist and university professor ought to be ashamed."² Perhaps he did not know that he blew his little bubble in the face of such scientists as Agassiz, Beale, Carpenter, Dana, Dary, Dawson, Faraday, Forbes, Gray, Helmholtz, Herschel, Lord Kelvin, Leibnitz, Lotze, Maury, Pasteur, Romanes, Verdt and hundreds of others who ascribe to God alone the power to originate life. 2. Prof. Townsend, "Collapse of Evolution," p. 14.

2. When the theory of spontaneous generation of life had to be abandoned THEY INTRODUCED A LITTLE OF GOD. But when He must be introduced then the whole theory of evolution in any form is weakened. If God is needed in a little He is needed in all. "Unaided natural forces can no more make one hair of the head than they can make the mightiest mammal that ever walked the earth or crushed forests under its feet."

3. These evolutionists assume that there has been all along in the inorganic world, and the world of life a universal law of development and improvement, of evolution and progression. But the more careful study of nature and life disclose such a mass of evidence pointing in the opposite direction, that scientists of the first rank "are saying scarcely a word as to continuous and universal progress. On the other hand they are freely using such words as retrogradation and deterioration. Since the human race began, though all sorts of artificial agencies have been employed and though there has been the closest scrutiny, yet not a distinctively new type of plant, or animal, on what is called broad lines, has come into existence; but thousands have disappeared never to return, and many others are slowly but surely marching to their doom."

And moreover the whole magnificent procession of living things, with the human family at its head, has stopped; nor is there any expectation that it will ever again begin to advance. And from the present indications and tendencies man has no ground of hope as to continuance or improvement, except by the grace of God in the realm of mind and Spirit, with which these evolutionists have nothing to do. Birth, growth, decline and death are one of nature's most exacting laws, and no truer of the insect of a day, than of the physical structure of man,"¹ or the circling planets. Human history

is but a graveyard of dead empires and lost civilizations. "E'en worlds grow old, and stars grow cold, and suns forget to shine." 1. Townsend, "Collapse of Evolution," p. 16. 1. Townsend, "Collapse of Evolution," p. 16.

4. MULTITUDES OF SPECIES, FLORA AND FAUNA, SHOW NO DEVELOPMENT WHEN COMPARED WITH THEIR EARLIEST TYPES.

We condense from Professor Townsend the following facts. "The Algae or sea-weeds, that appeared in the distant Silurian deposit, millions of years ago, were no less perfect than those of the same class found in our modern seas. The oak, the birch, hazel and Scotch fir, easily traced back thousands of years, have remained all this time without the slightest improvement. Insects that built the coral reefs of Florida, in the three hundred centuries of their existence have shown no improvement. The crayfish group, that first appeared near the close of the Carboniferous period, have gained nothing, though vast geological periods have gone by. The highest type of mollusk known to scientists is the one that appeared far back in geological history. The same may be said of the earliest fish, reptilian and mammalian families. Each appeared at the outset in the fulness of its power, and never since has shown the least improvement. Professor Ritter of California, in deep sea soundings at a depth of seven and one half miles, found living creatures essentially identical with those that are now found in geological strata, raised from the sea-depths of millions of ages ago. The earliest ones are as absolutely perfect, as marvelously beautiful in color and structure, as any living creature, large or small, that came into existence in later ages. Now every such fact weakens and discounts the theory of evolution.

Coming to early historic times, it is found that mummies of cats, ibises, birds of prey, dogs, crocodiles, and heads of bulls, discovered in the tombs and temples of upper and lower Egypt, placed there from four to five thousand years ago are identical with their living representatives.

5. Man does not improve, viewed biologically. Professor Boca, who made a very careful study of the celebrated "Cro-Magnon skull," belonging to the earliest stone age, says: "The great volume of the brain, the development of the frontal region, the fine elliptical profile of the anterior portion of the skull are incontestable evidences of superiority and are characteristics that are usually found only in civilized nations." Prof. Huxley, describing one of the oldest fossil skulls, says that, "so far as size and shape are concerned it might have been the brain of a philosopher."

6. The evolutionist is confronted with the troublesome fact that **THERE IS NO UNIVERSAL LAW OF ADVANCEMENT**; on which his theory depends; but in scores of instances there is a pronounced deterioration of parts and functions. There is one family of the Ascidia, a group that begins with backbone, throat and cerebral eye, each of which disappears as the animal matures, and is never restored. Some of the parasite species begin with legs, jaws, eyes and ears, but lose them all, becoming after awhile a mere sac whose life ever after consists in absorbing nourishment and laying eggs. The first family are in a process of degeneration since the Devonian period. The modern mammalia do not equal in size and strength those that nourished during the geological age to which they gave their name. From a biological point of view the human race has not advanced a step since the dawn of history, but on the whole, sometimes slowly, sometimes rapidly has been deteriorating. Except for the restraining and uplifting power of the religion revealed by God, the

human race might in time perish. Professor Cope declared that "Retrogradation in nature is as well established as evolution."

7. "A fuller statement of the case is, that SOME FORMS OF ANIMAL LIFE in geological history have remained fixed for millions of years, and are still living on; others appeared and remained without change for hundreds of thousands of years and then disappeared as suddenly as they came: others began to degenerate as soon as they appeared, and still others in more recent times under domestication, or artificial help, have been much improved, though, if left to themselves, they usually revert to their original condition. WHEN THEREFORE, THE EVOLUTIONIST, IN SUPPORT OF HIS THEORY, SAYS THERE IS IN THE KINGDOM OF NATURE ANYTHING THAT CAN BE CALLED A UNIVERSAL LAW OF DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVEMENT, HE MOST CERTAINLY IS NOT TELLING THE TRUTH."

8. "THERE is NO TRANSMUTATION OF SPECIES by either natural, or artificial processes. Evolutionists have held that by natural processes one species of plant or animal may be transformed into another, and that through long continued and progressive transmutations, the higher types of animal life, including man, have been evolved from the lower. If this is not established, then organic evolution has no scientific standing. Unless it can be shown that man is a transmutation from the ape family or from some other family back of the ape, from which it and man have both been evolved, then the theory breaks down in its most vital point, and is of no account.

About thirty years ago Huxley, in a desperate effort to find something to support his evolution theory, tried to give the horse pedigree. To this end he made use of a series of fossils, the first one about the size of a fox with four toes in front and three behind, that appeared in the Eocene strata according to Haeckel's 300,000,000 years ago (modest). After twenty to sixty million years there appeared another fossil a little larger with a smaller toe in front. After fifty million more years there was an animal as large as a sheep with three toes in front and three behind. Fifty million more years "the outer toe was reduced to a mere remnant." Then after fifty million more years "there came the animal about the size of a donkey with three toes all around; the middle toe persisting and the two on each side becoming dwarfed." "Finally the one-toed horse (a hoof) was evolved, the single toe being the middle one." These several animals beginning with the one of the size of the fox, were severally called Orohippus, Mesohippus, Miohippus, Protohippus, Pliohippus and Equus or horse. A Chicago professor, in a reply to a Boston professor wrote: "The modern horse can be definitely traced through a series of intermediate stages to a primitive species having four toes on each foot." Haeckel demanded about three hundred million years for the evolution of the; horse.

Now what are the facts, (1) Lord Kelvin the greatest scientist of England, made sport of these vast millions of years that evolutionists indulge in to make room for their theory. He declared that it could be proved from the way the earth is losing its heat that; less than 30,000,000 years ago the earth was so hot that no life: could exist on this planet. "Professor Tait in a still more penurious spirit cuts the time down to ten millions of years."

(2) There are no connecting links uniting those so-called ancient antecedents of the horse to each other. "In each case these differently toed animals lived their geological periods and then

disappeared, having had neither ancestors nor descendants. Each species abruptly appeared, remained fixed during their period, and then, suddenly disappeared, and where thousands and even millions of, the intermediate forms of the different species are demanded by the evolutionist, not one that is assured has been discovered." '

(3) "The very species that ought to connect those supposed, earlier ancestors with the modern horse, thus forming the needed" missing links, are entirely unknown in geological history."

(4) There is no such resemblance between those fossils and the modern horse, as would prove any organic connection. One writer says, "No evidence at all."

(5) The records in the rocks are perfect enough to establish fixity of thousands of species through all the geological ages since vegetation began on the planet. But there is not the slightest evidence whatever that the Orohippus was the progenitor of the Mesohippus, nor that the Mesohippus of America was the parent of the Miohippus of Europe. The presumption is wholly in favor of the theory that they were independent of each other. The presumption is strengthened by the fact that closely allied forms have been found that are not in the line of succession at all, just as there are today monkeys and apes, closely allied, but not derived one from another. There is nothing so distressingly missing in all science as; "the missing links" that would prove the truth of the evolution theory. Nature's reluctance to preserve them is amazing and unaccountable! When these fatal facts were presented to Darwin and Huxley they contemptuously waved them aside saying, "Oh, these intermediate forms need not be looked for." But why not? What humiliating dodge in a man of science! But the truth is, when man gets to arguing for a theory of infidelity, he either loses his honesty or his logic.

But a change has come. One writer says: "No reputable geologist, or paleontologist, at the present time is at all satisfied with the evidence of the horse pedigree derived from these fossils." And yet this veritable rubbish, that is getting stale, was published in a textbook bearing the date of 1908 (which lies before us) and is taught to our boys as if it were true science.

We may remark in passing that if losing fingers and toes and getting hoofs and increasing in size, is proof of evolution and advancement, there may be in the far distant future, a descendant of that Chicago professor that has evolved off all his fingers and toes but the middle ones, filling his chair in Chicago University, with his hoofs on the table waving his long ears and braying to a class of donkeys on the subject of evolution!

This same Chicago professor, we are told, ventured this announcement: "A few years ago there were discovered in Java the skull and portion of a skeleton of a creature to which the name 'pithecanthropus erectus' was given. Competent paleontologists and anthropologists today believe it to be a real connecting link between man and the lower animals." Now these are the facts: "In September, 1891, Dubois, a Dutch physician, discovered a tooth on the island of Java, about forty-five feet below the surface of the earth; a month later he found the roof of a skull, three feet from where he found the tooth and in August, 1892, he found a thigh bone forty-five feet further away, and later another tooth. This is all that was ever found of the wonderful pithecanthropus.

A year or two later twenty-four scientists met at Leyden and examined these remains. Ten of those scientists concluded that they were nothing but the bones of an ape, seven held that they were those of a man, and seven concluded that they were the missing link. So less than one third of those eminent scientists ascribed any importance to these remains. Professor Cunningham of Dublin afterward decided that part of them were fossils of a baboon, and the others were human remains." And this is the sum of evidence of the transmutation of monkey into man, after more than half a century of boasting, and hunting for missing links! (Wm. J. Bryan, delivering the principal address to the memory of the Titanic dead, in New York, used these words: "Let no man bring to my deathbed for my consolation, 'Darwin's Descent of Man.' Rather let my friend read to me the twenty-third Psalm: 'The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall not want.' His remarks were interrupted by a storm of applause." The great orator voices the best thought of the millions in more things than politics. The people are getting tired of this evolution theory.)

9. WHEN WE LEAVE THE FIELD OF GEOLOGY AND COME TO BIOLOGY THE EVOLUTION THEORY FARES NO BETTER. Nothing is more remarkable than the utterly trivial arguments by which it is supported. (1) The evolutionist calls attention to the fact that the human body begins as a cell only one hundred and twentieth of an inch in diameter and develops into a man weighing two hundred or more pounds. But what has that to do with the derivation of species or transmutation of one species into another? The cell and the man are one and the same being. From cell to man no change of species takes place. The pretentious argument is only a bubble which a little pin of logic can puncture in a second. (2) Then, from the fact that the human embryo passes through stages in which there is a remote resemblance to a worm, fish, reptile, and quadruped, the evolutionist argues that the human race has, therefore, been evolved from worm, fish, reptile and quadruped. It is a monstrous conclusion from insufficient data. Because the crystals in snowflakes and the crystals in quartz have a striking resemblance does that prove that the quartz descended from the snowflake? Because the root-like base of the crystal resembles the lower part of a tree does that prove that quartz-crystals were the progenitors of oaks? There are types running through nature; but to use them "to bolster up the theory of organic connections and transmutations is about as flagrant a misuse of scientific facts as one can imagine." (3) Then these men have written volumes to make people believe that the fins of a fish developed into the paws of animals, and they developed into the hands of men. But it is only bold theory and daring assumption; and what is lacking in evidence is made up by audacity.

(4) Another wise man thinks he finds a slight thinning of the skin that covers the head of a snail, an approach to an eye; in a slightly higher order he thinks he finds a slight depression; in another order of life there is a sack with something like a pinhole; and so on, until we reach the marvelous eye of man. But all they can guess at or say no more proves an organic connection between the spot of thin skin on the head of a snail and the eye of man than it proves an organic connection between the man in the moon and George Washington. (5) They have written volumes about rudimentary or useless members. "The range of their investigations has been from whales to snails, and from men almost to midgets; but in all this writing there cannot be pointed out a single sentence bearing on evolution that can be called a strictly scientific statement; it is ingenious, very ingenious and interesting conjecture; and that is all." (6) They have looked wise, and talked about metamorphosis and tried to make it support evolution. They have pointed to the evolution of the yolk into the chicken; of the tadpole into the frog; the evolution of ovum into the larva, then into the pupa, then into the perfect insect, and called this evidence that nature transmutes one species into another. But

in what sense have these admitted facts the slightest bearing upon the argument? "From a biological; point of view the fecundated yolk and the chicken, the tadpole and the frog, the larva and the butterfly, are one and the same thing." It is no more an evidence of evolution than when a bulb becomes a lily, or an acorn grows into an oak. When scientific men are driven to the use of such worthless argument (?) the theory they are defending must be hopelessly stranded.

10. ANOTHER FACT IS MOST TROUBLESOME TO THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION-SPECIES DO NOT CROSS. "Among the twenty thousand species of animals already classified, not one instance is known where different species have been crossed that the result has not been sterility in the animal thus begotten." Now if, with man's fertile mind to superintend and aid in the crossing of different species of animals, it always ends in failure, is there one millionth of a probability that the lower orders of animals (unaided) did it successfully through all the ages?

11. VARIATION OF SPECIES. It is reported that Professor de Vries of Amsterdam appears to have developed a mutable species of primrose. California fruit growers are reporting new varieties of fruit. "But the facts are that nothing has been accomplished in the way of natural or artificial variation outside of an 'oscillation around a primitive center'." And Professor Peschel of Leipsic points out that "these 'mongrel forms' never have been successfully established nor perpetuated beyond a few generations. Any abandonment of original types is followed by the complete extinction of the family." It clearly indicates that there is "no tendency in nature towards the transmutation of species."

12. IF THERE WERE SUCH A TENDENCY, THERE COULD BE NO SCIENTIFIC CLASSIFICATION OF PLANTS OR ANIMALS. But what are the facts? When a new fossil is discovered of an animal hitherto unknown, the skilled paleontologist locates it at once in its proper order and class. But how is he able to do it? Simply because through the geologic ages, the species have been permanent. But if evolution were true, and species were changing into other species and these transmutations were going on everywhere there would be such a confusion and variety of forms, among plants and animals that scientific classification would be impossible. Instead of the connecting links being absolutely "missing" as they are now, the woods would be everywhere full of them. But the rocks declare that there never was any such confusion: and the woods declare there is no such confusion now. "It is estimated that at the present time there are two and a half millions of different species of plants and animals, and that during the vital period of the world there may have been fifty times that many. And yet, in all this vast number, in the field of geological history, and in that of human history not a discovery has been made indicating that there has been a single case of transmutation." It is overwhelming evidence against the theory of evolution.

13. "BRING FORTH AFTER ITS KIND," says Genesis. It is the law of life today. The sea-weed for untold ages has brought forth "after its kind." So have all the trees of the forest, and the plants and flowers of the field propagated themselves, each "after his kind."

a. Says A. L. Gredley, A. M., in "Thoughts on Evolution": "There are millions of protoplasmic vegetable cells everywhere about us, each one capable of receiving a life principle, but only from its own peculiar source, and then its potency is confirmed to development along its own peculiar

line. The protoplasmic cells on an incipient corn-cob cannot be fertilized by the pollen of the rose. They must be fertilized by pollen from the corn tassel, and then they will appropriate the nutriment brought to them by the parent stalk and develop into corn, and into nothing else. Other flora will receive their life principle from other sources, but each from its own and exclusive source, and will develop along its own line and no other." The horticulturist depends upon the permanence of this beneficent law. So, does the agriculturist, and the physician- everybody, in fact, but the evolutionist. It bursts his bubble.

b. It is so in the animal kingdom. "Of the five hundred species of trilobites that existed through millions of years, not a fossil has been found by the paleontologist indicating that a single individual of any of these species ever produced anything but a trilobite. The same may be said of the nine hundred extinct species of the ammonites, of the four hundred of the nautilus and of the seven hundred of the ganoids: among these there is not the slightest trace of deviation from that law of God that each shall bring forth "after his kind." It is so now, from the wriggler gnat to man. No species breaks away from its ancestral line.

c. Scientific men are deeply concerned in the disease producing BACTERIA: each species produces a different disease. But how would the doctors be balked if these bacteria severally developed into each other, and began to do a different kind of work! Medical science would soon be thrown into utter confusion.

d. And there are the billions of BIOPLASTS, that construct the human body. "Each not only attends strictly to its own business, one species forming bone, another muscles, another brain tissue, etc., but no bioplast ever violates the law that like shall produce like. Indeed, if the transmutation of species among bioplasts were possible, there would be no assurance that another normal human body would ever be brought into existence or kept alive a single day."

e. Then there is the STRUCTURELESS GERM in the way of evolution. "Biological science recently announces that the structureless germ of one species of plant never has been and never can be changed into the structureless germ of another, much less into that of an animal; and that the structureless germ of one species of animal never has been and never can be changed into the structureless germ of another." Hertwig insists that "animals "differ among themselves as much in their germ cells as in their full formed organisms." "This renders," says DeCyon, "improbable, if not impossible, a common origin of different animals from the same cell." "The germs of all life at the very threshold of their creation, are as immutable as the most highly organized plants and animals known in natural history."

Thus to use the language of men of science, "the protoplasmic cells," "the structureless germs," "the bioplasts," are all against the theory of the transmutation of the species, and in support of the law that clearly marked species forever shall be preserved inviolate and' distinct.

14. Missing links are greatly needed and never found. "Links, between fin animals and footed animals, between reptiles and mammals, also between reptiles and birds, and between apes and men, have been sought with the most untiring zeal, and never found." They now despair of ever finding them. And when these evolutionists are confronted with these insuperable difficulties to their great fad, they resort to the dextrous art of twisting and wriggling out of their difficulties. One

of their methods is to look wise and, solemn and say, that "the demand for missing links or any other proofs of their theory, is unreasonable and whoever makes it is no scientist and does not know what evolution is!" They probably imagine they create the impression of possessing superior wisdom; but to intelligent and thoughtful people who are trained to reason, it is a stupid bluff, put up to conceal the utter collapse of their argument, and the bursting of their "bubble."

15. Man, and all we know of him, is against the theory. The gulf of separation between man and any other species of animal is bridgeless and the separation is complete. A professor at Yale is credited with these two sentences: "Animal life on this continent developed no higher than the South American monkeys. The Old World current developed into the anthropoid ape and then, by a colossal accident, into man!" And that evidenceless, atheistic, "colossal" foolery is spewed out on a class of students in the sacred name of SCIENCE at our own dear Yale! Shades of Dana!

These evolutionists would have us believe that man has been on the earth some hundreds of thousands or millions of years. They must have vast time for their theory. And they teach that he began as a hairy beast, and has worked his way up through a savage state to his present degree of perfection. Now all evidence is against their theory. As to man's age on the earth-Winchell and others show that "man has no place on earth until after the ice age . . . the very beginnings of our race are still almost in sight." Professor Joseph Prestwich shows that the close of the glacial period falls within 12,000 years. M. Adhemar and Dr. James Croll say 11,000 years ago. Professor Salisbury and Warren Upham say from 7,000 to 10,000 years ago. With these agree Prof. G. Frederick Wright and Winchell.

And all the evidence points to the fact that man started on the earth in the fullness of his glorious powers. As far back as we have traces of man he was at his best. The spade of the archeologist is bringing up proof that two thousand years before Abraham, there was a high civilization in the valley of the Nile, and in the region of the Euphrates, vast libraries, codes of laws, books about Astronomy, Astrology, Geography, Jurisprudence, Theology, and Histories, of still earlier days, treatises on architecture, and on mechanics and sculpture. These books or tablets were arranged and classified as books are now in modern libraries.

"In Crete, 4,000 B. C., there were royal palaces having sanitary conditions superior to those in any city in America until within a few decades. Indeed, in the most primitive times of which there is any record, man enjoyed a degree of civilization not surpassed in any period of the world's history earlier than the middle of the last century" (Prof. Townsend). History everywhere gives abundance of evidence of the decadence of man, but none whatever that he sprang from a hairy beast with a tail, and evolved into a civilized man. Southern Europe, Northern Africa, Asia, Central and South America give abounding evidence that greater peoples once occupied those lands than dwell there now

16. The study of PHILOLOGY is also against the evolutionist. "If philological science clearly demonstrates anything, it is that primitive tongues in almost every instance, disclose a background of high civilization." The study of comparative religion leads to the same result. Professor Schlegel says: "The more I investigate ancient history, the more I am convinced that the nations set out from a true worship of the Supreme Being." "The earliest ethical codes that have been discovered, those of Egypt and Babylonia, in loftiness and purity, quite put to blush modern

systems of ethics, except where the Bible has come in touch with the people." "In a word, every discovery in the last twenty-five years has demonstrated the fact that, so far as is known, the first beings on earth that wore the human form, were not brutes, nor even barbarians, as evolutionists tell us, but had bodies just as perfect, brains or intellects, just as capable of working, and languages just as complete in expressing thought, as those of any people now living." (Professor Townsend). But all this means that no field of investigation gives the theory of evolution any support. "The biologist knocks out most of its underpinning, the geologist demolishes the larger remaining part, and the archaeologist finishes it.

Mr. Huxley talked about the tragedies of science, by which he meant the slaying of beautiful speculative theories by "provokingly unreasonable facts." It is doubtful if any theory of science was ever sounded over the world with such a blast of trumpets, or with such impudent vaunting of carnal hearts. It is also doubtful if any other ever went to a more tragic end from the stabs and blows of "provokingly unreasonable facts," that is fast coming to this theory of evolution, so dear to Huxley.

Some one may say with a sneer, "Oh, that is only the opinion of a theologian!" Very well, we will let the kings of science speak. "Louis Agassiz, Joseph Henry, Arnold Guyot, and John William Dawson pronounced evolution false and unscientific." We will let Dawson speak who was elected to the presidency of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1886. He says in his "Story of Earth and Man," p. 396, on "Scientific Apeism": "As applied to man the theory of the struggle for existence and survival of the fittest, though the most popular phase at present, is nothing less than the basest and most horrible superstition! It makes man not merely carnal but devilish. It takes his lowest appetites and propensities, and makes them his God and Creator, his higher sentiments and aspirations, his self-denying philanthropy, his enthusiasm for the good and true, all the sufferings and struggles of heroes and martyrs, not to speak of that self-sacrifice which is the foundation of Christianity, are, in the view of the evolutionist, mere loss and waste, failure in the struggle of life. What does he give us in exchange? An endless pedigree of bestial ancestors, without one gleam of high or holy tradition to enliven the procession: and, for the future, the prospect that the poor mass of protoplasm, which constitutes the sum of our being, and which is the sole gain of an infinite struggle in the past, must soon be resolved again into inferior animals or dead matter! That men of thought and culture should advocate such a philosophy, argues either a strange MENTAL HALLUCINATION, or that the higher spiritual nature has been wholly quenched within them. It is one of the saddest of many sad spectacles that our age presents."

We will next hear from LORD KELVIN, also president of the British Association. We have quotations from his own pen but not at hand. We find this from a paper of June 3, 1908. "Lord Kelvin, with whose name history will link more great discoveries in the realms of science than with the name of any of his contemporaries, was once asked what he considered the greatest discovery he had ever made. Without a moment's hesitation he answered: 'My greatest discovery is that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief.' In the face of the oft repeated assertion of shallow persons that all our scientists are agnostics it is good to remember this frank humble statement of the greatest scientist of them all, and he declared there were insuperable difficulties in the way of accepting the theory of evolution."

We have more direct testimony from LIONEL S. BEALE, who stood with Lord Kelvin at the head of English scientists. In an address at Victoria Institute 1903, he said: "The idea of any relation having been established between the non-living and living, by a gradual advance from lifeless matter to the lowest forms of life, and so onward to the higher and more complex, has NOT THE SLIGHTEST EVIDENCE from the facts of any section of living nature of which anything is known. There is no evidence that man has descended from, or is, or was, in any way specially related to, any other organism in nature through evolution, or by any other process. In support of all naturalistic conjectures concerning man's origin, THERE IS NOT AT THIS TIME A SHADOW OF SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE."

Dr. Etheredge, superintendent of the department of natural history in the British Museum partly quoted before, declares: "In all this great museum there is not a particle of evidence of transmutation of species. Nine-tenths of the talk of evolutionists is sheer nonsense, not founded on observation, and wholly unsupported by fact. They adopt a theory, and then strain their facts to support it. I read all their books, but they make no impression on my belief in the stability of species. Moreover the talk of the great antiquity of man is of the same sort. There is no such thing as a fossil man. Men are ready to regard you as a fool if you do not go with them in all their vagaries. But the museum is full of proofs of the utter falsity of their views."

M. Meunier, in *Revue Scientifiques* (Dec., 1903) antagonizes all theories of chemical or mechanical origin of life, or the TRANSFORMATION OF SPECIES, but argues in favor of special creations by an infinite power: "Doubtless the cause of life and its manifestations on the earth is exterior to the earth and that it is anterior to our world." That means God.

PROFESSOR VIRCHOW, highest German authority, and "foremost chemist on the globe," once was inclined to evolution; but he was compelled by facts to change his view. In his lecture on Freedom of science, he said of evolution: "IT is ALL NONSENSE. It cannot be proved by science that man descends from the ape or from any other animal. Since the announcement of the theory, all real scientific knowledge has proceeded in the opposite direction." Subsequently at a convention of Anthropologists in Vienna, Virchow confirmed his previous utterance in these words: "THE ATTEMPT TO FIND THE TRANSITION FROM ANIMAL TO MAN HAS ENDED IN TOTAL FAILURE. The middle link has not been found AND NEVER WILL BE." It was this Virchow that called the evolution clubs "bubble clubs."

Professor Zoekler, of the University of Griefswald, employs these words on the subject: "The claim that the hypothesis of descent is secured scientifically must most decidedly be denied. Neither Hartman's exposition nor the authorities he cites have the force even of moral conviction for the claim for purely mechanical descent. The descent of organisms is not a scientifically demonstrated proposition."

PROFESSOR FLEISCHMANN of Erlangen: "The Darwinian theory of descent has in the realms of nature NOT A SINGLE FACT TO CONFIRM IT. It is not the result of scientific research but purely the PRODUCT OF IMAGINATION."

Professor Ernest Haeckel, of Jena, the coarsest, rankest, most daring and unscrupulous defender of naturalistic evolution in all Germany, gives a testimony in the form of a witticism, that he is standing

almost alone: "Most modern investigators have come to the conclusion," he says, "that the doctrine of evolution and particularly Darwinism is an error and cannot be maintained." He then names several men whom he calls "bold and talented scientists" who once believed in evolution but now have turned against it. He mentions Dr. Dennert, Dr. Goette, the Strasburg professor, Professor Edward Hoppe, "the Hamburg Savant"; "Professor Paulson of Berlin, who has declared that Haeckel's theory "is a disgrace to the philosophy of Germany." He also named Professor Rutmeyer, the paleontologist of Basel, who charges evolutionists with "PLAYING FALSE WITH THE PUBLIC AND WITH THE NATURAL SCIENCES": also Professor Wundt of Leipsic, who in his earlier days wrote a book in support of evolution, and in a later publication characterizes those early writings "AS THE GREAT CRIME OF HIS YOUTH, THAT WILL TAKE HIM ALL THE REST OF HIS LIFE TO EXPIATE": "and so," adds Haeckel, "he is now writing the other thing."

We want now to say some more about this Professor Ernest Haeckel, who has been a little god to these vaunting American evolutionists, the one they quoted, copied after and swore by. He was the fiercest exponent of evolution in all Germany, and tried to prove that man evolved gradually from lower animals, to refute the Bible, to destroy faith in the immortality of the soul, and faith in a personal God as creator.

Shortly before his retirement in disgrace in February, 1909 there was a startling exposure made of some of the shameful methods by which he tried to bolster up his false science against Christianity. Over his own signature he was compelled by other scientists to admit deliberate forgeries in his scientific writings. He had taken drawings of other biologists, and altered them, taking away many vertebrae from a monkey embryo and changing the name. He also altered a human embryo so as to make it contain eleven vertebrae not occurring in the original. Thus he tried if possible to bridge the chasm of the never-to-be-found "missing link" and to bring monkey-kind and mankind together, and disprove the word of God. He confessed over his own signature that 8 % of his embryo diagrams were really forgeries, "to fill up and reconstruct the "missing links" by hypothesis." "Other scientific men," he said, "are open to the same charge. The great majority of all morphological, anatomical, histological, and embryological diagrams are not true to nature, but are more or less doctored."

And so this idol of evolutionists, quoted and adored and blindly followed steps down and out, covered with lasting disgrace and he drags down his companions with him.

Professor Elie DeCyon says: "Among Haeckel's innumerable works published in all tongues and issued in thousands of copies, one searches in vain for a single thought emanating from him that is worthy of preservation." He quotes Professor Chwolson the eminent physicist of St. Petersburg: "All that Haeckel explains and affirms concerning questions of physics is false, and shows an ignorance of the most elementary problems, which is hardly believable." And F. Paulsen, the late Berlin University professor says: "I have read the 'World Riddle' of Haeckel, and have reddened: with shame at the thought of the general education of our people! That such a book should be possible, that it should be written, printed, bought, admired and taken seriously by the nation of Kant, Goethe and Schopenhaur, is a sad fact indeed." DeCyon points out that the falsification of plates, which Dr. Arnold Brass has recently discovered in Haeckel's books, are no new thing. Professor Semper of Wurzburg in 1877 devoted twenty pages to similar falsifications. A year

earlier, Professor His called attention to the fact that Haeckel was picturing the fetuses of a dog, a chicken and a mole with a single plate, labeled in three different ways. Yet for decades, Haeckel's books have been given to students for consultation by our verdant American professors! For decades, this mountebank has imposed on the international public as a king in the world of thought."

We wonder how the little "me-too" evolutionists of America, who have aped Haeckel, like their photograph as taken by foreigners. We also ask ourselves, what kind of a theory is it in science, that, in lieu of better evidence, must be bolstered up by falsehood and forgery, doctored drawings and lying pictures? Evolutionists will please rise and answer.

M. DeCyon declares that thirty years ago there were more opposers of evolution than is generally realized. Among them were Virchow, von Baue, Floreus, Milne-Edwards, Claude Bernard, and Quatrefages, but their opposition was too timid, or too disdainful to be effective. He says: "The theory of an APISH ANCESTRY FOR MAN IS PURE ASSUMPTION," He quotes Fraas, who devoted his long life to the study of fossils: "The idea, that man has descended from any Simian species whatsoever, is certainly the most foolish ever put forth by a man writing on the history of man. It should be handed down to posterity in a new edition of the 'Memorial on Human Follies.' No proof of this baroque theory can ever be given from discovered fossils."

De Cyon quotes Virchow: "I have never found a single ape! skull which approaches at all the human one. Between man and ape there exists a line of sharp demarcation. If we compare known fossil men with men of today, we can boldly affirm that the individuals of a low development are much more numerous, relatively, among present day men than among fossils. In other words the race is degenerate rather than the fruit of an exquisite development" (Literary Digest, September 9, 1911).

The year Darwin died the evil influence of his teaching was pointed out where least expected, in France. L'Univerers made the following criticism: "When hypotheses tend to nothing less than the shutting out of God from the thoughts and hearts of men and the diffusion of the leprosy of materialism the savant who invents and propagates them is either a criminal or a fool."

"The atheistic evolutionary speculation," says DeCyon, "found immense popular vogue among those who desired to see the Creator dethroned, who wished to be delivered from religion and the restraints imposed by the moral law on covetousness and human passion." It found brow-beating exponents in men like Haeckel, and succeeded, for a time in silencing objections." But ruin was in its wake. What else could be expected? "Any theory that tends to dethrone God, elevate monkeys and degrade men (every scheme of evolution points that way) is sure, if followed to end in disaster." Haeckel published this illuminating sentence: "There is no room for God in the Universe."

Supernatural evolution as now taught, no less than naturalistic, antagonizes traditional Christianity. The Bible Cosmogony never can be harmonized with any possible theory of evolution" (Townsend). It antagonizes the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. As an English author puts it, "we are shut up to a choice between the Bible and Evolution." The new form of the theory that contends for the creation of a few germs, and from them the evolution of all plants and animals, is

neither Biblical nor scientific. Whatever form the theory takes, they are all one in their practical influence on the religious thought of the time. There is a distinct trend in them all toward infidelity. Those who give the theory, in any form, a hospitable reception, soon break away from the Gospel moorings, and all allegiance to the great doctrines of Christian faith.

We would feel like making an apology for discussing this subject at such length, were it not for the fact that this wretched, unproved, charlatan theory of science has been before the country for fifty years, poisoning the religious atmosphere with the deadly malaria of infidelity. It has been wedded to higher criticism and its diseased impotent child is the new theology. Its influence on the church of God has been as blasting as mildew. It has produced the most spiritually incompetent ministry Protestantism has had in more than a century. It has filled the land with sordidness and greed, chilled the zeal for missions, checked revivals, and made a famine in the ministry. Young men who are lectured to by an infidel evolutionist six days in the week, and on the seventh are preached to by an infidel, new-theology, higher critic, will not develop a passion for the ministry, and the saving of souls.

God commands us to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." It is high time that the friends of the Bible collect their artillery and go a hunting for the infidels in pulpits and college chairs.

Even the Chicago Chronicle, a few years ago inflicted a fearful castigation upon such infidels: "We are struck with the hypocrisy and treachery of these attacks on Christianity. Is there no place in which to assail Christianity but a divinity school? Is there no one to write infidel books except the professors of Christian theology? Mr. Mangasarian delivers infidel lectures every Sunday in Orchestra Hall, and no one is shocked: but when professional defenders of Christianity jump on it and assassinate it, the public, even the agnostic public, cannot but despise them. We are not championing either Christianity or infidelity, but only condemning INFIDELS masquerading as men of God and Christian teachers!"

Professor Townsend closes his "Collapse of Evolution" from which we have quoted so freely, in these words: "As a result of our investigations there are before us the following facts: (1) The failure of evolutionists to establish the claim that original life germs came into existence by natural processes; (2) Their inability to show that in the world of living things, there exists a law of development and improvement; (3) the complete breakdown of their claim that, by natural processes, lower species of plants and animals may be transmuted into higher; (4) the fact that in all early and late excavations and researches not one connecting link between any of the millions of different species has been found; (5) the fact that mental science and all the physical sciences have not yet discovered a particle of evidence showing or even suggesting that any animal ever has reached or ever can reach a point where, slowly or suddenly, it can come into possession of a human soul, a human mind, or a human body; (6) the fact that biologists, geologists and archaeologists have overwhelmingly silenced the assertion that the human race began low down, and through countless ages has worked itself up to its present state; (7) the downfall of the scarecrow and utterly false, though continually repeated, assertion that scholarly men, men of science, and the world's great philosophers are all evolutionists; (8) the recent abandonment of evolution by those who once held the theory and who at the present moment are making vigorous assaults upon it; (9) the absolute incompetence of evolutionists and "advanced theologians" to

formulate any system of ethics or religion that at all approaches those made known by ancient Jewish prophets and New Testament evangelists. In view, therefore of this majestic array of facts, need there be a moment's hesitation in saying that the hypothesis of evolution, together with all other speculations, so far as they are attached to it, **NEW THEOLOGY, HIGHER AND DESTRUCTIVE CRITICISM INCLUDED, HAS COLLAPSED BEYOND ANY HOPE OF RESTORATION?"**

And here is a lately written essay by Rev. Professor Geo. Frederick Wright, D. D., LL. D., one of the most favorably and widely known scientists in the world, on the subject, "THE PASSING OF EVOLUTION"! We remember listening less than a quarter of a century ago to a so-called scientist, lecturing on evolution: he turned to a certain preacher in the audience with blazing eye and said: "The day is not far-distant when a preacher who does not believe in evolution will be wanted as a freak by a 'Dime Museum.' The tide is now rapidly turning, and ere long it will not be the preacher, but the evolutionist who will be the museum freak. Professor Wright mentions that "Darwin's expounders positively assert that all organic beings had been equally independent of supernatural forces. Nothing will satisfy them but to assert that the elephant, the bear, the mouse, the kangaroo, the whale, the shark, the shad, birds of every description-indeed, all forms of animal life, including the oyster and the snail-have arisen by strictly natural processes from some minute speck of life, which originated in far distant time. . . . Nor does this by any means bring them to their final goal; for, to carry out their theory, they must leap to the conclusion that life itself has originated spontaneously by a natural process from inorganic matter. It need not be said that such conclusions rest **UPON VERY ATTENUATED EVIDENCE**, such as is not permitted to have weight in the ordinary affairs of life!"

Prof. Wright points out how these evolutionists had a small estimate of each other's opinions. Darwin wrote how mean he felt when he saw how "Spencer was a dozen times his superior, even in the master art of wriggling!" Spencer did not appreciate Darwin's "gemmules" and he and Bates and Hooker and Huxley could not appreciate Spencer's "vitalized molecules." Professor Shater, shortly before his death declared that "the Darwinian hypothesis is still unverified." Dr. Etheredge says that: "In all this great British Museum there is not a particle of evidence of transmutation of species." Darwin declared that the 306,662,400 years necessary to his theory is "a mere trifle" of time!" This has been cut down by scientists to 24,000,000 years as all that is necessary for all geologic changes, "which necessitate a rapidity in the development of species which must be regarded as by leaps and bounds, and would well accord with the (Bible) theory of Creation by Divine intervention."

"The absurdity of supposing that animals acquire their advantageous qualities by chance variations, is shown in the pertinent illustration from the anatomy of the cat. To give the cat power of leaping to any advantageous height there must be simultaneous variation in all the bones, sinews, and muscles of the hinder extremities: and, at the same time to save the cat from disaster when it descends from an elevation, there must be variation of a totally different character in all the bones, and tendons, and muscles of the fore limbs. So numerous are the simultaneous changes necessary that the probabilities against their arising fortuitously run up into billions, if not into infinity." "To suppose that all the peculiarities that distinguish man from all other animals, must have taken place simultaneously and by chance, without the intervention of the Supreme Designing Mind is to commit logical hara-kiri. Such chance combinations are beyond all possibility of

rational belief." Professor Wright in his conclusion calls evolution, "The Craze of the Last Half Century which is little more than the recrudescence of "ancient philosophy!" Egyptian and East Indian mythology evolved everything from an egg. Anaximander, like Huxley, traced everything back to "infinity" and pristine mud. Anaximenes deified the air. Diogenes imagined a "mind-stuff." Heraclitus traced the soul of man to fire. Modern evolutionary speculations have not made much progress over those of the ancients. In their bolder forms they are "deistic" (with as little of God as possible and that little hundreds of millions of years ago). We cannot banish God from the universe without first stultifying ourselves. Clerk Maxwell one of the most distinguished physicists, says: "I have examined all the varieties of evolution that have come within my reach, and have found that every one must have God to make it work" (Back to the Bible, Chapt. VIII).

But still these evolutionists go on "wriggling" out of all the insuperable difficulties that confront their theory and continue to advocate their "craze." Thank God the David of scientific truth has arisen to challenge this braggart Philistine. It is the most baseless, vaunting, impudent, infidel theory of science that has ever swaggered across the field of human thought. It has ruined more preachers and stultified more teachers than any other that can be named. It is high time that the intellectual and Christian world was arousing from this nightmare of foolishness, and returning to the reverent and humble recognition of God and his superintendence and intervention in the creation of all species of life. Before the great Wm. Gladstone died he had a controversy in the London Times with Mr. Huxley. Mr. Gladstone's contention was: "That the order of creation as recorded in Genesis has been so affirmed in our times by natural science that it may be taken as a demonstrated conclusion and established fact. This might be summed up in the three statements in which science and Moses agree, namely, "that life appeared upon our planet in the order of first the water population; second, the air population; and third, the land population." Mr. Huxley's answer broke down so completely that the great London lawyer, Sir Robert Anderson said: "So far as this controversy is concerned, he left his opponents in possession of the field. The fact asserted by Mr. Gladstone remains established by this searching test."

Mr. Huxley appealed to Professor Dana of Yale in a letter to the Nineteenth Century, saying, "There is no one to whose authority on Geological questions I am more readily disposed to bow, than that of my eminent friend, Professor Dana." Professor Dana answered, "I agree in all essential points with Mr. Gladstone, and believe that the first chapter of Genesis and science are in accord." "In 1905, the London Times contained the following: 'No one possessed of a sense of humor can contemplate without amusement the battle of evolution. Never was seen such a melee. The humor of it is that they all claim to represent science. The plain truth is that though some agree in this or that, there is not a single point in which all agree. Battling for evolution they have torn it to pieces. Nothing is left even on their own showing save a few fragments strewn about the arena.'

In the Pall Mall Magazine, Sept. 1906, Von Hartman thus sums up the attitude of modern science to evolution: "In the sixties of the past century the opposition of the older scientists to the Darwinian hypothesis was still supreme. In the seventies the new idea began to gain ground rapidly with all cultured circles. In the eighties Darwin's influence was at its height, and exercised an almost absolute control over technical research. In the nineties for the first time a few timid expressions of doubt and opposition were heard, and these gradually swelled into a great chorus of voices aiming at the overthrow of the Darwinian theory. In the first decade of the twentieth century it has become apparent that the days of Darwinism are numbered."

Edison, the great inventor, writes: "There are more frauds in science than anywhere else. Take a pile of these books that I could name, and you will find uncertainty if not imposition in one-half of what they state as scientific truth. I have been thrown off my track often by them. The repeated assertion that the most scholarly men, the ablest scientists and philosophers are all evolutionists, is downright misrepresentation."

A distinguished living writer, who is himself an expert in modern science; says: "After many years' investigation of the philosophy of evolution, an investigation carried on in full sympathy with the widest application of that captivating theory, I HAVE YET TO SEE PROOF OF A SINGLE FACT, SHOWING, OR TENDING TO, SHOW, THE PRINCIPLE OF THE SO-CALLED 'LAW' OR 'PRINCIPLE' OF EVOLUTION IN THE WORLD OF NATURE. NO INSTANCE HAS EVER BEEN FOUND OF A LIVING THING OF ONE SPECIES, COMING FROM ANCESTORS OF ANOTHER SPECIES, AND THERE IS NOT THE SLIGHTEST GROUND FOR THE BELIEF THAT SUCH A THING EVER HAPPENED. On the other hand, every one of the countless billions of reproduction of living creatures, the grass, the herb-yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit which occur every year, are in accordance with the divine command in the first chapter of Genesis, 'After its kind!'"

A man of high scientific authority writes: "As science has been compelled to correct her blunders, or acknowledge the truths supposed to be demonstrated were only unproved conjecture, the conflicts between Genesis and science have died out, so that at the present time assured teachings of science afford no weapon against statements of the Bible.

On the contrary the investigations of men in the fields of Geology, physics and paleontology have brought into view much information recorded ages ago in the Bible, information which determines that the Bible was written not in the knowledge of men. All investigations of all the searchers have failed to produce evidence sufficient to convict the Bible of a single false statement."

In the face of the flippant sneers at Paley's argument from design, for the existence of God as out of date, Lord Kelvin (Sir Wm. Thompson), the greatest scientist of his time wrote: "I feel profoundly convinced that the argument of design has been greatly too much lost sight of in recent biological speculations. Overwhelming proofs of intelligent and benevolent design lie around us, and if ever perplexities, whether metaphysical or scientific, turn us aside from them for a time, they come back upon us with irresistible force, showing us through nature the influence of a free will, and teaching us that all living things depend upon one everlasting Creator and Ruler."

"The influence of evolution is everywhere baneful and disastrous to faith and spirituality. Darwin himself in his earlier years was a professing Christian. But before his life ceased he made this sad confession: "Disbelief crept over me at a very slow rate, but was at last complete. I am like a man who has become color blind. Though once capable of wonder, admiration and devotion in the presence of the works of God, now not even the grandest scene could cause any such convictions and feelings to rise in my mind. For myself, I do not believe that there ever has been any revelation." And he died refusing to believe in a future state, and abandoning all faith in the Christian religion.

Herbert Spencer's testimony was not less sad. Writing to a friend a little before his death, he referred to the outcome of his long life of intense labor and profound investigation and the net result of his work to himself and added that it amounted to little more than the conviction of some force that was bearing him on its bosom but perhaps only like a drop to be lost in the ocean at last. And to his friend he expressed the deep and melancholy confidence that the prospect of the past and the future equally failed to bring any satisfying rest or comfort to his soul (Simpson, "Old Faith and New Gospels," pp. 14-22). Depend upon it, the pursuit and advocacy of truth bring no such end to a life.

In the face of such facts and such testimony from the master minds of the scientific world, we still feel quite comfortable. We continue to believe in God, and in His Holy Word, even Genesis. We do not believe in the theory of evolution. It is a most pernicious theory, baseless of fact, unproved and incapable of proof. And we do not fear being lassoed and caged in that museum! Even the world-famed scientist, Dr. Milliken has been reported as saying that "Evolution never has been proved and never can be proved." A guess is not science. The truth is the Evolution theory is the most cruel hoax and the most unscientific hypothesis his Satanic Majesty ever inflicted on a Devil-cursed age. It has duped more teachers and befooled and disgraced more college professors, and made more preachers incompetent infidels, and kept more young pupils from Christ and salvation than any other falsehood that has ever found a lodgment in the mind of man.

* * * * *

CHAPTER XIII -- GOD IN PROVIDENCE

A God able to make a universe is wise enough and great enough to control it. This is the well-nigh universal conviction of men.

1. This truth is directly affirmed in the Bible in every conceivable way. Neh. 9:6: "Thou art Jehovah, even thou alone; thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their hosts, the earth and all things that are thereon, the seas and all that is in them and thou preservest them all." Ps. 104: 3: "Who maketh the clouds his chariot; who walketh upon the wings of the wind"; verse 4: "Who maketh the winds His messengers; flames of fire His ministers"; verse 6: "The waters stood above the mountains"; verse 7: "At thy rebuke they fled; at the voice of thy thunder they hasted away"; verse 9: "Thou hast set a bound that they cannot pass over"; verse 13: "He watereth the mountains from His chambers"; verse 14: "He causeth the grass to grow for the cattle; and herb for the service of man"; verse 21: "The young lions roar after their prey, and seek their food from God"; verse 27: "These wait all for Thee, that Thou mayest give them their food in due season"; verse . 28: "Thou givest unto them they gather; Thou openest thy hand, they are satisfied with good"; verse 29: "Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled; Thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to their dust"; verse 30: "Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created; and thou renewest the face of the ground." Col. 1: 17: "In Him all things consist." Heb. 1:3: "Upholding all things by the word of His power." Pages of similar quotations might be made; teaching the providence of God as impressively as human language . could state it. '.

2. God's providence is universal. It includes all worlds, and all orders of beings. No realm of nature could be exempt. God's providence must have to do alike with the infinite and the infinitesimal.

3. God's regulation and control of the universe must be contemplated in different aspects. First, comes His relation to physical; events which are subject to the laws of Cause and effect, and are directly and absolutely under the control of the Divine will. Under the head of physical events must be included the creation of matter, and all its changes and modifications not dependent upon finite will; and the creation of animal life, and even the creation of mind, with all its comprehensive sense, embracing both the material and the spiritual world.

4. Since the material universe is the work of God's hand, His control of matter, its forces and laws and movements, must be immediate and absolute. Matter is the instrument which he uses as he pleases. The constitution and forces of nature are the machinery He employs for working out His holy ends.

People have much to say about the laws of nature, as if somehow they were something quite apart from God, and could get on very well without Him. The simple fact is the laws of nature are nothing but God's regular method of using matter. As Phillips Brooks said: "The laws of nature are the hands of God, executing His will." It must further be borne in mind, that these laws of this physical machine are no end in themselves, and have no special significance save as they help on the moral plans of God. The material universe has no value in itself. Its adjustments and movements find their importance in their bearing on something beyond themselves in the realm of sentient and moral beings, whose welfare can be a rational end. "The material universe exists as a means, and not as an end."

5. There are those who would have us believe that God or something impressed the natural laws upon the material universe at the beginning, and that they are now changeless. There is now no need, and never has been, of his oversight, or intervention, or preservation, or further superintendence. God is now a supernumerary in the universe, a mere spectator of his machine of endless motion.

It is an unscriptural theory, and inconsistent with the absolute dependence of all things on God. Moreover, "God's infinite attributes imply that His control of this mechanism is complete and perfect; that He must be able to use it with absolute freedom in the furtherance of his plans; and that He cannot be restrained or hampered by the mere machinery, as men are hampered by their own constructions. It must be perfectly subservient to His will.

It must be true, moreover, that He can act upon this mechanism to modify or restrain its operation, either from within, through the forces themselves, beyond finite vision; or from without by manifest and miraculous interposition.

The occasion for any such interference cannot lie in God's inability to give the machinery originally any form that might please Him. The limitations are not in Himself, but in the necessities of finite moral creatures, to whom such a divine manifestation might be needful. Such absolute control of the material universe, on God's part, is involved in our conception of it, as, the work of

His hand! "In short, that is the real meaning of creation, preservation and providence" (Fairchild's Theology, p. 94).

6. It is necessary to speak more of this preserving providence within the sphere of physical nature. It has been widely held that "if matter were left without the upholding power of God, even for an instant, it would fall into nonentity. Hence its continued existence must be through the unceasing conservation of His power." Cocker says: "The conception of the Divine conservation of the world as the simple, uniform, and universal agency of God, sustaining all created substances and powers in every moment of their existence and activity is the Catholic doctrine of Christendom." Miley adds: "This citation includes spiritual being just as it does the material; for if the doctrine be true respecting the essence of matter it must also be true respecting the essence of mind."

Miley thinks the accuracy of this view may be fairly questioned, and that a distinction has been overlooked between the essence of matter, and its orderly forms. He doubts whether the simple being of matter would fall into nothing or be annihilated of itself; but holds that the texts bearing on the subject refer not to mere masses of matter but to their organized forms. Yet he afterward says: "As matter is the creation of God, and continues to exist only on the condition of His good pleasure, and is wholly subject to His use for the purposes of His wisdom, it is, in a very profound sense, dependent upon Him. There is also a like dependence of mind. Such a dependence satisfies all the requirements of reason and Scripture."

7. Here we meet a curious doctrine that "PRESERVATION is A CONTINUOUS CREATION." Illustrious names are reckoned among the defenders of this theory, among them Augustine, Aquinas and Edwards. The latter stated his views thus: "It follows from what has been observed that God's upholding created substance, or causing its existence in each successive moment, is altogether equivalent to an immediate production out of nothing, at each moment; because its existence at each moment is not merely in part from God, but wholly from Him, and not in any part or degree from its antecedent existence. For the supposing that its antecedent existence concurs with God in efficiency, to produce some part of the effect, is attended with all the very same absurdities which have been shown to attend the supposition of its producing it wholly. Therefore the antecedent existence is nothing, as to any proper influence or assistance in the affair; and consequently God produces the effect as much from nothing as if there had been nothing before. So that this effect differs not at all from the first creation."

It seems incredible that such men should ever have entertained such an opinion. The objections against it are grave and insuperable.

(1) It would destroy all continuity of existence. If God creates any given thing each moment out of nothing, it ceases to be the same thing. It is something new and absolutely unrelated to whatever existed before it. It would compel God not only to create a universe but also to annihilate one each second, all of which is big with absurdity.

(2) This would also destroy all evidence of the existence of an external world. What we had regarded as evidence we should be compelled to conclude was only an impression on our senses, which we would attribute to things out of ourselves, but were really momentarily produced by the creating energy of God.

(3) This theory would set aside all second causes. "God becomes the sole agent and sole cause in the universe. The heavens and the earth with all their changes and all they contain, are but the pulsations of the universal life of God. If preservation be a continued production out of nothing, of everything that exists, then every material existence, all properties of matter so-called, every human soul, and every human thought and feeling, is as much the direct product of divine omnipotence as the original creation." 1. Hodge, Vol. I, p. 579.

(4) On this theory, there can be no responsibility, no moral character, no sin, no holiness. If there is any sin or vice, it must be charged to God, for that as much as virtue or goodness is the result of His creative energy. An illustration will suffice. Suppose that God one instant created Cain in a fit of jealousy: the next He creates him angry: the next He creates him reaching for a club; the next He creates him fiercely swinging it through the air: and the next He creates him striking down Abel with the murderous blow! Who but God would be responsible for the murder of righteous Abel?

(5) To make conservation a continuous creation leads to conclusions opposed to the great truths of religion, and at war with our necessary beliefs. We are compelled by the constitution of our own nature to believe in the existence of the world, and in the reality of second causes. We know from consciousness that we are responsible for our own acts, and that we preserve our identity from day to day, and from year to year. Therefore it cannot be that we are created anew and unrelated each moment.

It is better therefore not to have any complex or far-fetched theory about how God preserves the universe, or the mode in which His efficiency is exerted, but to rest satisfied with the simple statement that "preservation is that omnipotent energy of God, by which all created things, animate and inanimate, are upheld in existence, with all the properties and powers with which He has endowed them" (Hodge).

8. It is a legitimate inference from the infinite power and wisdom of God and His creation and preservation of the universe, that He has AN INFINITE PLAN that includes all events of nature, and all actions of animate and moral beings. His purpose must be all pervading, and in some sense controlling. Such a control is supremely desirable, and accords with the teaching of Scripture. There we are told that God feeds the ravens, clothes the grass, notes the fall of the sparrow, numbers the hairs of our head. "He meteth out the waters by measure. When He made a decree for the rain, and a way for the lightning of the thunder" (Job 28: 25, 26). "When He made firm the skies above. When the fountains of the deep became strong, when He gave to the sea its bound, that the waters should not transgress His commandment" (Prov. 8: 28-29).

The necessitated conditions and movements of the material world, the order and course of nature, and all events lying in the realm of cause and effect, beyond the reach of finite will, are embraced in God's absolute decree.

9. There is a philosophic speculation called OCCASIONALISM; which denies all secondary causality in material nature, and finds: in God the only agency operative in the physical realm. The doctrine is the utter forcelessness of physical nature, and that God is; the only operative force. The

occasions which call out God's activity; are in no sense conditions of the divine agency, but are only coincident in time.

The implications of this theory are very surprising. "Matter"; says Miley, "would have no instrumental quality, is reduced to a blank. It must be denied all the qualities with which philosophy has invested it. Gravitation, cohesion, chemical affinity, magnetism, electricity, without force in themselves, are simply coincident with the divine energizing. The lightning can have no part in riving the oak, the projected ball no part in breaching the wall, for any such part is possible only with the possession of force. The massive cables of steel which seemingly uphold the Brooklyn bridge have no natural strength of support, but are the mere occasion of the divine energizing as the sustaining power, and for which so far as natural strength is concerned, threads of cotton might answer as well. Indeed, if this occasionalism be true, there is no natural weight of the bridge, which is possible only with a natural force of gravitation, and but for a mighty pressure of the divine hand, there would be no weight to sustain. The tree planted by the rivers of water has no natural advantage over one planted in the most and desert. The stomach has no more natural fitness for digestion of food, than the dish in which it is served. The eagle's structure gives no natural strength for flight, while there is no reaction of the air against the stroke of his wings."

Such are the absurdities into which the speculations of men run them; and their theories break down by the weight of their own extravagance. This one leads to idealism and pantheism.

In marked contrast with it is the true theory which supposes that the Creator has constituted the world with certain qualities, attributes, tendencies and forces, by which one part has a causal influence on another, and one state or combination of parts or forces produces another, according to what we call the laws of nature.

These bring about a succession of events which we call the operations of nature. At the same time **ALL THESE FORCES AND QUALITIES ARE PERVADED BY THE LIVING PRESENCE OF GOD**, Sustaining and inhabiting the world he has made and governs. His supreme control may vary the usual operation of these natural forces whenever he wills. "Ordinarily he neither sets aside the causal qualities of nature, nor leaves them to themselves. This is the reconciliation, if any were needed, of the primary and secondary causes. **GOD is IMMANENT IN NATURAL CAUSATION**, as truly and necessarily as in natural being, in the operations as in the existence of matter or minds" (Randall's "First Principles of Faith," p. 233).

10. PROVIDENCE AND THE LOWER ANIMALS. God governs the lower animals by appetites, by instincts, and by some traces of intellect, not sufficient however to make them responsible beings. Impelled by these natural instincts and appetites, they propagate their species, seek their food, and perform the various functions for which they are qualified. Thus the honey bee makes, uninstructed, its marvelous cell; the "ant provideth her meat in the summer, and gathereth her food in the harvest"; "the stork in the heaven knoweth her appointed times; and the turtle, and the crane, and the swallow observe the time of their coming." The birds of passage forget not their season.

God sometimes employs irrational animals as instruments to accomplish his will. Thus the frogs, and lice and flies, and locusts, were his instruments in punishing the Egyptians. The fiery serpents

chastised Israel for murmuring against God. These and similar facts show that the dumb beasts are under the government of the God that made them.

11. BUT THERE IS A PROVIDENTIAL GOVERNMENT OVER MORAL BEINGS This is more complex and of a different nature still. God is the author of the intellectual and moral constitution of man; but with respect to their moral actions the case is different. Of these he could not become the efficient cause without destroying their nature; for no action can be moral unless it is free. We must not therefore, expect that God's government over moral beings will be by way of force or compulsion; it must be by moral influence. If men are not free to act, they cannot be justly held accountable for their actions; for their acts would not lie within their own power. If, therefore, we would not overthrow all principles of morality and responsibility, and degrade ourselves below the level of moral beings, and if we would not falsify the moral feelings God himself has put within us, we must hold to our INNATE CONVICTION OF MORAL FREEDOM.

"When we come to the responsible voluntary action of moral beings, a new relation must subsist between God's plan and purpose and the result. The causative force in such action must be the agent himself. God's relation to that action is moral; that is, permissive or persuasive, but not properly causative. His power, however exerted, must work in harmony with, and through the voluntary powers of his creatures. The power of God in such cases, therefore, must operate in the form of MOTIVE, not force in the sense of natural omnipotence. The finite will is interposed between the will of God, and the result in the free action of the creature; and the chain of cause and effect between the will of God and that; result, in the strict sense is broken. The resulting action is not directly, and properly, the work of God, but of the moral creature to: whom the act belongs. The sinful action of such a being cannot; properly be spoken of as God's act. God has given the power to the creature for such action, and permitted its exercise. The virtuous action of the moral being is not God's in any other sense than that He gives the power, and furnishes the motive, or incentive.

Thus the creation of moral beings involves the existence of a power which is not directly in its action, controlled by omnipotence; and thus the occurrence of events is provided for, which God disapproves, and which He cannot wisely prevent. The existence of, moral beings implies the existence of the power to sin; and the re- o suit is actual sin; and this God cannot approve or desire. Of course, he could in the exercise of His omnipotence, annihilate the creature, or suppress His moral agency. Perhaps He could prevent his sin by an excess of restraining motive, but not wisely; and if God should act unwisely His great power to secure righteousness in the moral universe would be lost, and He Himself would fail in righteousness" (Fairchild's Theology, pp. 95, 96).

12. The existence of moral beings, and a moral universe, implies that there is a portion of God's kingdom which He does not control by omnipotence. He might have refused to create such beings, but, after creating them, he must leave them the subjects of moral government, under the sway of moral law and moral influence, perfectly free from coercion, or the compulsion of omnipotent power. "This may be looked upon as a limitation of omnipotence but we must remember that it is self-imposed, provided for and accepted by God in giving existence to moral beings. But the clearer thought is that omnipotence can sustain no direct relation to moral action, in the way of determining its character, to prevent sin or to produce virtue. Such results lie out of the domain of

physical power; they cannot be thought of as the result of power on God's part, but of the free will, the personality which He has given to His creatures. The physical world God controls by power; the moral world He controls by motive. With the creation of moral beings arises the obligation, on God's part, to treat them according to their nature. Their well-being becomes an end to be regarded." 1. Fairchild's Theology, pp. 96, 97.

13. PROVIDENCE AND SIN. This subject is complex, and, in some of its aspects, is mysterious and, in some respects, beyond our understanding. There is a theory of God's relation to his universe which practically rules out all divine providence; there is an opposite extreme which makes God the responsible cause of everything.

The latter view is much in evidence in Calvinistic theology, where occur such statements as the following: "God from all eternity did by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass." "In relation to the foreknowledge and decree of God, the first cause, all things come to pass immutably and infallibly." "God's determinate counsel extendeth itself even to the first Fall and all other sins of angels and men, (and that not by a bare permission) which also he most wisely and powerfully boundeth, and otherwise ordereth and governeth in a manifold dispensation, to His own most holy ends" (Saybrook Confession, A. D. 1708). "The decrees of God are His eternal purposes, according to the counsel of His will, whereby, for His own glory, He hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass." "By decree we are to understand a purpose, a fore-ordination, a will, and an appointment." "The decree of God has for its object whatever comes to pass." "All the actions of the creature, whether good or bad, fall within the decree of God." "The everlasting state of angels and men is fixed by God." "The decrees are immutable or unchangeable as God himself." "God executes his decrees in the works of providence, in which He preserves and governs all things according to His eternal purpose and counsel" (Shorter Catechism). "This providential government is the universal sway of omnipotence which renders certain the accomplishment of his designs, which embrace in their compass everything that occurs" (Hodge, Vol. I, p. 582).

We need not quote such shocking utterances further. They are nothing short of blasphemous assertions against the character of God and his government. "Any theory of providence that must either render moral action impossible, or make God the responsible agent in all sin, can have no place in a true theology" (Miley). It is the part of wisdom to find a middle ground of truth between such irreverent and irrational extremes.

On the relation of providence to sin we make the following observations.

a. It is false to fact and a libel on God to say that he did "from all eternity freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass." And, "all the actions, of the creature, whether good or bad, fall within the decrees of God." And, "God executes, his decrees in the works of providence." For God commands every moral, being not to sin, and declares He is angry with the wicked every day. Now the commands of an infinitely wise God cannot be op-posed to His decrees; and if the wicked are fulfilling His decree He could not be angry with them. The divine Being hates sin with a perfect hatred, and has announced the penalty of it to be eternal punishment. Now to say that God unchangeably ordains by decree all the crimes and vices of men, and brings them about by His providence, and then eternally punishes them by His judgments, is to charge him with malignant

hypocrisy! And after that, to call Him "HOLY" is an abuse of language. Nobody indulges in such absurdities but theologians who are mentally bewildered by a false theology. Truth is sane, and is not self-contradictory.!

b. It is only in a limited sense of the word, that God is said to "permit" sin. He neither wished it, nor wills it, nor commits it. He brings all the moral influences he can wisely use into action to prevent its commission by others. He forbids sin and threatens it with punishment, and inflicts the penalty. The only sense, there-, fore, in which he may be said to permit it is that he does not prevent it by physical coercion. This is not a moral permission, as if he approved of sin, but physical, by which he suffers it to be committed. The meaning is that he does not interfere in the exercise of His power, as he doubtless might do, to prevent sinful actions. If God should thus prevent His moral creatures from sinning he would force their will and destroy their agency and accountability. Therefore, for wise and holy ends he permits (that is, does not forcibly prevent) sin. This view is in harmony with Scripture, "My people would not hearken to my voice; and Israel would none of me, so I gave them up to their heart's lust; and they walked in their own counsels. Oh, that my people would hearken unto me. That Israel would walk in my ways" (Ps. 81: 11-13). It shows that God wishes there were no sin and no sinners. "And Jehovah, the God of their Fathers, sent to them by his messengers, rising up early and sending them, because He had compassion on His people, and on His dwelling place; but they mocked the messengers of God, and despised His words, and scoffed at His prophets, until the wrath of Jehovah arose against His people, till there was no remedy" (2 Chron. 36: 15, 16). "Oh do not this abominable thing that I hate."

c. Though God did not decree that moral beings should sin, and He is not the author of it, and hates it, yet in a way it is still included within His control and superintending providence. When God does not forcibly prevent men from sinning, neither does He suffer them to go beyond His notice and control. Wicked men are at all times under the superintendence of Divine Providence, and subject to such restraints as God in His wisdom sees proper to impose. He can say to them, as He says to the raging waves of the sea, "Hitherto shall ye come but no further." He has the means to circumscribe the wickedness of sinners. "Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee; the residue of wrath shalt thou restrain" (Ps. 76: 10).

d. Moreover, though God hated sin, and did not want it in His universe, and did not by decree make it necessary that any particular sin should be committed, yet he did decide to create moral beings foreknowing that many of them would sin. Then it became necessary for Him to take such providential notice of it as would still make it redound to His glory. In this sense only do "God's decrees and providences include all the sinful actions of men and angels." He decreed to create a moral universe that would certainly but not necessarily sin: and He further decided that by His providence he would so handle sinners and even their sins as to glorify Himself. Therefore God providentially overrides sinful actions so as to bring good out of evil. The introduction of sin into the world, though not at all decreed or desired by God and absolutely forbidden, and though followed by most dreadful consequences, has nevertheless given rise to the brightest manifestations of the glory of God. It has also called out the highest exercise of His benevolence in the atonement of Christ, and the salvation of many of these same sinners through His blood.

The real plan of God was to make and govern a moral universe for His own glory. He providentially carries out His plan through the movement of His moral creatures, and His own

oversight and restraint, and overruling of their conduct, so as to subserve His own end. And He does this without suppressing or interfering with free agency, or touching or affecting the character of the agent. The Scripture illustrations of this truth are numerous. We see it in the case of Joseph. His conspicuous piety, and the envy and malice of his brethren, were alike made subservient to the divine plan. They each played their part unimpeded, and God overruled it to carry out His plan concerning His chosen people. Joseph explained it thus: "Ye thought evil against me; but God meant it for good, to bring to pass as it is this day to save much people alive." The obstinacy of Pharaoh in resisting the demand of God,—"Let my people go," was employed in the furtherance of the great movement of His providence. Had Pharaoh obeyed, God might have given Him the honor of leading the Exodus, such honor as Abraham Lincoln now has, but He disobeyed, and God made Him a conspicuous example of the folly of resisting God, as a warning to men. So with Judas, His selfishness and greed and avarice, which were of his own making and choice, together with the voluntary malignity of the people and priests and rulers, in crucifying the Savior, were all used by God for the salvation of uncounted millions of mankind. So that it could be written, "he was delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God." Let a man first make himself wicked, then God's providences may help to determine just what form His wickedness will take.

Thus God's plan is the general one to glorify Himself in the government of a moral universe. His providence is His method of so handling and using and disposing and superintending all the voluntary actions of men and angels that, willingly or unwillingly, they shall work out the divine purpose and exhibit the divine glory. This sovereign plan of God to glorify Himself in the movements of all moral beings, encompassing all human life and action, and the certainty of it but not its necessity. No sin was ever necessary in the universe of a holy God.

e. The following words from President Fairchild about the relation of God's decrees to moral conduct we commend to prayerful thought: "The word 'DECREE' is not properly used to express the relation of God's plan and purpose to the voluntary, responsible, acts of his creatures. The existence of men, and the conditions under which they live, so far as not dependent upon human will, are subjects of God's decrees; as also the use of which God shall make of their acts but human character, free action, and voluntary choice, are not decreed. By God's arrangement men form their own character, cherish their own intentions, plans and purposes; but the divine plan envelops them all; and, do what they may, they subserve that plan. The divine arrangement in reference to human action, has sometimes been called God's permissive decree; which must mean simply that He has not decreed the free acts of men, but decreed to permit them. A permissive decree can mean no more than this.

This view of the relation of human character and action to the will of God, makes God the author of the moral system, and His moral creatures the authors of sin. Sin exists by permission on God's part, and by responsible action and causation on the part of His creatures.

In view of God's infinite attributes, his power and wisdom and goodness, we must believe that, as a matter of creation, this is the best possible world; the best that infinite wisdom could devise, and infinite power execute. God has done his best in it, and could not make it better. But the world, with all its moral conditions and facts, is not the work of God alone. Every moral being has cooperated with God in its production. The world, therefore, is not the best world that could exist; but the best that God could make. Every moral being who has sinned could have made it better. It

would have been better without his sin. To the question is sin necessary to the greatest good, we must answer, no; but the possibility of sin, or the permission of sin on God's part, is necessary to the best world, because it is necessary to any moral system" (Fair-child's Theology, pp. 99, 100).

14. PROVIDENCE AS RELATED TO DIVINE SOVEREIGNTY AND HUMAN FREEDOM.

This is God's universe, and He is on the throne. Neither human philosophy nor infidelity can take from Him His scepter and crown. His sovereignty is secure. A companion truth to divine sovereignty is human freedom. This we know from consciousness. We know we are free, whatever theorists may hold to the contrary. Any true doctrine of providence must be in harmony with both these truths. However much they may deny it, Calvinists so state their doctrine of divine sovereignty and providence as to deny human freedom and make God a moral monster who is logically responsible for all sin. On the other hand, many Arminians are so zealous to exalt human freedom that they deny God's fore knowledge and by so much belittle His providence. A true theology must embrace both truths, and so state them that they become harmonious.

The attributes of God make Him the natural and rightful sovereign of the universe, a universal and absolute monarch. "But it does not involve on His part the right to treat His creatures arbitrarily, or in any manner not suitable to their nature. In creating moral beings He comes under the obligations of benevolence in regard to their treatment. He must be just and good and merciful and holy. His sovereignty is only the sovereignty of infinite power and wisdom and goodness exercised in doing the best that is possible for all the beings that He has created" (Fairchild's Theology, p 101). Pages and pages might be quoted from Calvinistic literature controverting all these truths, and teaching that God, as a being of infinite power, has a perfect right to do whatever He will with all finite beings, regardless of their good. The following specimen will suffice: "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, at others foreordained to everlasting death." "These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished." "The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He PLEASES? for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin (which was also ordained) to the praise of his glorious justice" (Westminster Catechism). The Bottomless Pit might be safely challenged to produce a more wicked reflection on the character of God. It makes him an unjust, unpitying, and arbitrary tyrant!, Such a being not our God.:

15. Many terms have been used by different writers to j press different phases of God's providence, the uniform agency-God in nature, as distinct from his occasional interpositions. These have been called the general providence and the special providence. 2. The immanent and the transcendent. But God is purely personal and supernatural in his immanence, as in his transcendence. 3. As natural and supernatural. Natural providence then would mean that which operates uniformly, by the so-called laws of nature, which is only a name for God's ordinary method of operating natural forces; but, just because God is a person, a change of method, or a supernatural interposition is always possible. God's ordinary method of operation is for fire to burn; but he super-naturally interposed to prevent it from burning the Hebrew children. We are often not wise enough to tell which method of operation God is using. In any event, it is all alike divine, though not equally manifest to us.

16. Aside from the plain teaching of Scriptures, there are MANY CONSIDERATIONS WHICH CORROBORATE THE DOCTRINE OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE. (1) It is logically implied in the personality and freedom of God. He is a personal Being, infinite in all His attributes. We cannot, therefore, suppose that He is a helpless prisoner in the machinery of nature of which He Himself is the author. A watchmaker is greater than His watch. He can take it to pieces; can remove a spring or jewel and substitute another in its place; can alter the regulator and make it go faster or slower; can turn the hands backward or forward; can stop it altogether and start it again. Is the infinite God less able to handle His machine? (2) It may be implied from the fact of a moral government. There is something sublime in the steady march of the seasons, and the marvelous precision of the movements of circling planets, and the steady action of nature's forces. But these things are nothing in themselves. They find their use and only end in the service of moral beings, and in the moral government of God. So God superintends all these material forces with that great end in view,- His own glory in the righteous administration of his moral kingdom. (3) It is a natural inference from the divine Fatherhood. Any earthly father might change his ordinary course of conduct, and push important business aside, and neglect a thousand interesting and delightful things, to watch over a sick child. What may not God be expected to do in the matter of general attention, and on special occasions, for the children of his love? His joy and honor and glory are wrapped up in their destiny. (4) It is involved in the privilege and efficacy of prayer. God has planted within us the instinct of prayer. He has also taught us to pray. Of what importance is the constancy of natural forces, and the continuance of secular interests compared with the spiritual needs and the eternal interests of beings who are to live in blessedness or misery forever? If our prayers are inspired by the Spirit of God, and are in harmony with the divine will, we may expect them to be answered, even though the answer should involve a temporary suspension of the customary operations of nature, such as the stopping of the flow of a river, or walking upon the waves, or the instantaneous healing of the sick, when all human skill and ordinary medicines had failed. God is master of all these forces and operations of nature; and Jesus of Nazareth can as readily as ever walk the waves, and hush the billows in the interest of his storm-tossed children, in answer to their inspired prayers.

17. Infidelity makes objection to the doctrine of God's providence. (1) On the ground of the immutability of God. Yes, God is immutable in infinite power and wisdom and goodness, and just because he is wise and good, and has the power to change his conduct as the interests of his spiritual kingdom demand, he alters his methods, whenever the occasion arises, to secure the good of moral beings. He adjusts His conduct to the changing needs of his children, or to the changing moral conduct of men. (2) It is objected that God is infinitely wise and good, and will do in the regular way what needs to be done, without any asking. He knows little about the meaning of prayer, who does not know that prayer removes hindrances and difficulties from the heart of him who prays and puts him in such an attitude toward God, that God can now do things for him which before could not have been wisely done.

John Stuart Mill said: "If there be a personal God a miracle is possible. Of course it is; and the denial of so plain a truth would betoken the most willful blindness. The possibility of a miracle is the possibility of a supernatural providence through a divine variation of the working of natural forces. The truth of theism is the refutation of this objection to a supernatural providence. The efficacy of prayer does not subject the course of nature to the caprice of men, nor is the agency of

providence subversion of the order of nature."1 Providence itself is the "order of nature," and the God of providence, general or special, is the inspirer and answerer of prayer. He can attend to His own affairs, and keep His machine of nature from breaking down, while He answers a prayer inspired by Himself. 1. Miley, Vol. I, pp. 344, 345.

"The providence of God, so far from being in any contrariety to the orderly course of nature, is in fact the ground of its uniformities. The contrary view arises from the false notion that a divine agency within the course of nature must be capricious and disorderly. Nothing could be more irrational. Nothing could be more utterly groundless than any inference from the orderly course of nature that there can be no providential agency therein. 'For when men find themselves necessitated to confess an Author of Nature, or that God is the natural Governor of the world, they must not deny this again, because His government is uniform; they must not deny that He does all things at all, because He does them constantly; because the effects of His acts are permanent, whether His acting be so or not; though there is no reason to think it is not' " (Miley quoting Butler's Analogy).

Cocker says: "God is not simply the transitive but the immanent cause of the universe. He is in nature, not merely as a regulative principle impressing laws upon matter, but as a constitutive principle, the ever-present source and ever-operating cause of all its phenomena. . . . Nature is more than matter; it is matter swayed by the divine power, and organized and animated by the divine life" (Theistic Conception of the World, pp. 141, 142).

And while holding firmly to this truth, we need not slip off into Pantheism. God is not only in nature, but he is above nature. He was here before the earth was made; and after the heavens have dissolved and the elements have melted with fervent heat, and the earth has gone up in smoke, God will still be here. There is room for a distinction between ordinary events and miracles. "There are established forces in nature, and laws in accordance with which they act-forces which God has instituted, and which work mechanically according to the nature which He has given them, bringing to pass the ordinary events of nature, under divine supervision and control. At the same time there is room for divine intervention in the form of miracles, which involve a suspension' of the ordinary forces, or rather of their operation, and the bringing to pass of events by direct divine agency." God may also bring to bear a direct action of His power on the forces of nature and produce a special providence, which is not a miracle. President Fairchild here observes: "It is sometimes objected that it implies imperfection in the machinery of the universe, that a miracle or special providence must from time to time be interposed; but this is a misapprehension. The perfection of the machinery of the universe consists in its adaptation to the wants of moral beings, and that it has no end in itself. The material world finds its end and purpose in the moral; that machinery is best which meets moral ends. This view still provides for a reasonable doctrine of the divine immanence-the constant presence of God in his creation, and his direct supervision of all the interests of the universe" (Theology, pp. 104, IDS).

* * * * *

PART III -- ANTHROPOLOGY -- The Origin of Man; His Fall, and the Consequent Ruin of the Race.

CHAPTER I -- ORIGIN AND UNITY OF MAN

The doctrine of Anthropology which a theologian holds, is fundamental. It decides all his after theology. The whole system of the doctrines of salvation depends upon this foundation. It has a direct relation to the incarnation of Christ and all the work of redemption. Let these fundamentals be insecure and unscriptural, and a sentimental, flabby, liberal theology will compose the superstructure. Such a deplorable result is well-nigh inevitable. Thus questions of the nature and origin and early history of man are not simply of speculative interest, but are intrinsic and determining. If our present state is the same as our primitive state, or if there has been no moral lapse of the race, and its only fall has been "a fall upward," then there never was any need of Christ's redemptive mediation, and no necessity for regeneration or sanctification by the Holy Spirit. But if man has fallen, and the race is depraved, then we need a Divine Savior, to make atonement for us, and a Divine Spirit to secure our renewal and cleansing of heart. And so we stand on the threshold of the great truths of the Christian system.

1. THERE ARISES THE QUESTION OF THE ORIGIN OF MAN. There are three theories of evolution. 1. The first is purely materialistic and utterly atheistic. One advocate of this theory declares that "there is no room for God in the universe." Everything has been evolved by the movement of natural forces. Matter is the only real being, and is eternal. It first existed as a universally diffused fire-mist and somehow it went to whirling; and somehow it whirled into order and beauty and life.

2. Another theory permits the banished Creator to appear once on the scene and create a few living germs! How kind! Darwin thought that a few simple forms of life were the sum-total of the product of divine energy. From this inception the whole process of evolution is purely naturalistic. Even man is the outcome of this process.

3. A third party has held that God was not only active, in the creation of life, but has continued his agency through the whole process of evolution. Some have been theistic enough to hold that evolution is the method of God's creative work, his agency continuing through the whole process. Hence, say they, in the evolution of new species, mere natural force is supplanted by divine energy. Especially is this true in the case of man. Here again is a wide divergence of views, some holding that the human body is a product of evolution, and only the mind is a special creation of God, while others maintain that body and mind alike are the immediate creation of the Almighty.

When we open the Bible we get relief from these uncertainties of human speculation. In the earlier creations God said, "Let there be," "Let the earth bring forth," "Let the waters bring forth," "God spake and it was done." But when we come to man, it is more marked still. "Let us make man," as if the Trinity were united in the great work. "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." The plain sense of such words places man above all other orders as a spiritual and Godlike personality. To this being so "wonderfully made" in the image of his Maker, is given dominion over all the lower orders. The distinction between the soul and body is made plain in the more detailed account, "And the Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."

It will be observed from the above what an important subject this is in its far-reaching influence. "With the first theory of a purely naturalistic evolution and inclusive of man as of all other orders

of being, no place remains for any form of theology. Outright materialism is the only ground of such an evolution; and outright materialism is outright atheism. With atheism, atheology" (Miley, Vol. I, p. 357). By the second theory which kindly permits God to start life, but has no further use for Him in the origin of species not even in the origin of man, there can be no place for doctrinal anthropology or Christian theology. Man, as we have been accustomed to think of him, is lost, fallen to the dead level of cows and crows, and without any distinguishing excellence in himself. The theory removes God so far away, and has so little use for Him, that, like the first it is practically atheistic. No theory, which denies the transcendent and immediate agency of God in the creation of man leaves any basis for a Christian theology.

The third form of evolution, which admits that the mind of I man at least is not a product of evolution but is the result of a special act of creation, does leave sufficient place for God to make a foundation for doctrinal theology and anthropology and Christology.

But, as we have previously shown in our discussion of evolution, the day has passed when theologians need to be swerved from their true orbit of thought by any influence from this fad of modern science. It has been rejected and utterly scouted by the most eminent minds in the scientific world. Miley well says: "There is no urgency for haste in making terms with modern evolution. It is only an hypothetic structure without the substance of a science. With limitless assumption and dogmatism it lacks the material for the foundation of a science. There must be long waiting for the superstructure. The evolution of the human race is wholly without proof, and the sheerest assumption. There is the broad margin between man and the highest order below him-confessedly too broad for crossing by a single transition in the process of evolution. All search for connecting links is utterly fruitless. That broad margin remains without the slightest token of successive stages in the transition across to man. The Bible account of his origin in the creative agency of God remains, and will remain, the only rational account. The grounds-of a theological anthropology remain secure" (Vol. I, p. 358).

II. THERE ARISES THE QUESTION OF THE TIME OF MAN'S ORIGIN. Scientists are agreed, with the Bible, that of all living orders, man was the last created.

But of the date of his appearance on the earth,

1. We observe that scientists differ so remarkably among themselves, that it at least brings no credit to science. It strikingly illustrates the fact that much that is called science is nothing but wild speculation. For instance, Professor Lyell argued that "two hundred thousand years at least should be allowed for human life on earth." Wallace is comparatively moderate, but asks for a great stretch of time; "We can with tolerable certainty affirm that man must have inhabited the earth a thousand centuries ago, but we cannot assert that he positively did not exist, or that there is any good evidence against his having existed for a period of ten thousand centuries" (1,000,000 years). Professor Hunt advanced the opinion that man has been on earth not fewer than nine million years. Haeckel modestly estimates that it required not fewer than a thousand million years to evolve man from the lower forms of organized life, and not fewer than several hundred thousand years to lift him out of the brute condition from which he has been developed." The Frenchman, M. Lalonde, not to be outdone by these ambitious rivals for notoriety, "and not able to think of any way, scientifically, for starting the human family, he reached the sage conclusion that man was not

started at all, and therefore is eternal." Lord Kelvin humorously remarks that these evolutionists are very prodigal of time, like worthless spendthrifts, who have suddenly inherited a large fortune and are industriously scheming how to spend it. On the other hand, sober Christian scientists, in great numbers agree with Winchell that "man has no place in earth until after the ice-age." "The very beginnings of our race are almost in sight." As we have pointed out in the previous chapter, a great number of scientists of the highest rank place the advent of man as not more remote than from 8,000 to 12,000 years ago. We may name Professor Haynes, M. Reinach, Le Conte, Professor Holmes, Professor Edward Hall, Boyd, Dawkins, Gandry, Evans, M. Favre, Professors G. Frederick Wright, Prestwick, Adhimar, Croll, Salisbury, Upham, Winchell, Dawson, Hanson, Andrews, and many others.

2. This view makes no conflict with Bible chronology. The advent of man preceded the birth of Christ, according to the calculations of Archbishop Ussher, by 4,004 years, on the ground of the Hebrew Scriptures. But the Septuagint version, as reckoned by Hales, makes the time 5,411 years. Others have made the distance in time longer still. This uncertainty is no recent assumption, no device forced upon the biblical chronologist by the demands of science; it has long been felt. The tables of genealogy are the chief data in the case, and their aim is to trace the lines of descent, not to mark the succession of years. A careful study of the genealogies shows that it is said here and there that a man begot his grandchildren or even his great grandchildren, or a woman, bare them. "Thus in Gen. 46: 18 after recording the sons of Zilpah, and her grandsons and great-grandsons, it is added, 'and these are the sons of Zilpah and these she bare unto Jacob, even sixteen souls.' In Matt. 1: 11 Josiah begot his grandson Jechonias; and in verse 8, Joram begot his great-grandson Uzziah. In the Bible sense then 'to bear' and 'to beget' means to give descent, and whole generations were passed over. The tables were genealogical and not chronological. Thus no biblical chronology can have any doctrinal claim; so the usual reckoning may be extended to meet any reasonable requirements of scientific fact" (Miley).

"The extreme uncertainty attending all attempts to determine the chronology of the Bible is sufficiently evinced by the fact that one hundred and eighty different calculations have been made by Jewish and Christian authors, of the length of the period between Adam and Christ. The longest of these make it six thousand nine hundred and eighty-four years, and the shortest, three thousand, four hundred and eighty-three. Under these circumstances it is very clear that the friends of the Bible have no occasion for uneasiness. If the facts of science or of history should ultimately make it necessary to admit that eight or ten thousand years have elapsed since the creation of man, there is nothing in the Bible in the way of such concession. The Scriptures do not teach us how long men have existed on the earth. Their tables of genealogy were intended to prove that Christ was the Son of David and of the seed of Abraham, and not how many years had elapsed between the creation and the advent" (Hodge).

3. The evidence of the brutal character of primitive man is utterly wanting. As he came from the hands of his Creator, he was as mature in his mind as in his body, and with a language super-naturally given. By divine help he came quickly to a knowledge of nature and language. And, as now, this divinely taught language was transmitted from generation to generation. Multiplication of languages was by variation, just as they are multiplied now. "There are no facts in the history of the race which require the pure originality of more than one language." It does not require so much time to make new languages as might be supposed. They form very rapidly. "Thus on the breaking

up of the Roman Empire and the distribution of the people into separate nationalities their common language was soon transformed into the Romance-such as the French, Italian, Spanish and Portuguese. These languages now spoken by so many peoples, are not a thousand years old, and only the fraction of a thousand was required for their formation. It is the conclusion of Southall that of some five thousand languages now spoken only a half dozen are a thousand years old. If such is the work of ten centuries, no valid argument can be based on the multiplicity of languages for any great antiquity of man" (Miley, Vol. I, pp. 367, 368).

4. Another argument for the great antiquity of man is based on the distinction of races. The different races confessedly appeared very early in history. It is argued that only a very long time could have produced them. It must be granted that, on the theory of the unity of the race, more time would be required, than on the theory of an original plurality of races, or origins which of course require no extra time.

But wide variations in plants and animals can be produced in a brief time, and man is quite as susceptible to change. Buckle showed that every degree of latitude and every hundred feet of elevation above the sea wrought a slow but sure and perceptible change in the nature of man. Men early were widely separated and came into different climatic and food conditions. Prichard shows, in *Natural History of Man*, that "races of men are subjected more than almost any race of animals to the varied agencies of climate. Civilization produces even greater changes in their condition than does domestication in the inferior tribes. We may, therefore, expect to find full as great diversities in the races of men as in the domestic breeds. The influence of mind must be still more extensive and powerful in its operations upon human beings than upon brutes. And this difference transcends all analogy or comparison" (p. 75).

This is a question that concerns theology, because with the existence of our race on the earth, as many have supposed, only six thousand years, the unity of the race, on which Pauline theology depends, cannot be maintained. This is rendered impossible by the early appearance of the deepest variations of race. Therefore an extension of time beyond the generally received biblical chronology should be received with favor. As Argyll said: "As we value our belief in the unity of the race ought we to be willing to accept a greater antiquity for man than the dates in our Old Testament would indicate. The greater antiquity favors the unity of the race.

III. EVIDENCE FOR THE UNITY OF MAN.

1. Quaterfages defines species thus: "Species is a collection of individuals more or less resembling each other, which may be regarded as having descended from a single primitive pair, by an uninterrupted and natural succession of families." To this Jussieu and Linnaeus agree: "A species is the perennial succession of similar individuals in continued generations. The species is the chain of which the individuals are the links."

There are, then, two fundamental facts in species-resemblance and genetic connection. The doctrine may vary as it emphasizes one or the other; but these basal facts remain. The deeper idea is that of genealogical connection, which must be constant and complete.

2. Louis Agassiz, a most illustrious name in science, although openly opposed to evolution, was a devout theist. He held to separate and distinct origins for the human races, all of them alike created by God.

Some naturalistic evolutionists, also, hold to separate origins of the several human races. If such an origin of man is possible there may have been a plurality of origins. If the natural conditions might meet in one point for the evolution of man, they might meet in several places. And, say they, if the environment is a strongly molding force over all forms of life, the widely different conditions of human evolutions would be sufficient to account for the different races. But, it is objected, that some of the most diverse and widely separated races are easily traced back to an earlier connection, while decisive facts warrant the inference of an original unity.

There are wide variations of racial type, particularly in size, form and color. Hence the question arises whether these differences are consistent with a common parentage. It is a question of great interest to scientists, and one in which they are by no means agreed, not even as to the number of races. "The scale runs from four to five up to sixty or more, but the weight of scientific authority is for a unity of origin" (Miley). Manifestly a wide range of difference is compatible with unity of species. It is declared by Quater-fages that men differ less widely than plants and animals of the same species; "the limits of variations are almost always more extensive between certain races of animals than between the most distinct human groups. Consequently, however great the differences existing between these human groups may be, or may appear to be, to consider them as specific characters is a perfectly arbitrary estimation of their value. It is quite as rational, quite as scientific, to consider these differences only as characters of race, and even on that account to refer all the human groups to a single species."

It is objected that these varieties of type are as remarkable for their fixity, as for their early appearance; that through all the centuries of history and changes of environment they remain the same. Therefore, it is inferred that these differences are not the result of environment.

To this it is replied, that many variations have occurred in very recent times. Dr. A. H. Strong summarizes thus: "Instances of physiological change as the result of new conditions are the following: the Irish, driven by the English two centuries ago from Armagh and the south of Down, have become prognathous like the Australians. The inhabitants of New England have descended from the English, yet they have already a physical type of their own. The Indians of North America or at least certain tribes of them have permanently altered the shape of the skull by bandaging the head in infancy. The Sikhs in India, since the establishment of Babel Nina's (1500 A. D.) and their consequent advance in civilization, have changed to a longer head and more regular features, so that they are now distinguished greatly from their neighbors, the Afghans, Thibetans, Hindus. The Ostiak savages have become the Magyar nobility of Hungary. The Turks in Europe are in Cranial shape greatly in advance of the Turks in Asia from whom they descended. The Jews are confessedly of one ancestry; yet we have among them the light haired Jews of Poland, the dark Jews of Spain, and the Ethiopian Jews of the Nile Valley. The Portuguese who settled in the East Indies in the sixteenth century are now as dark in complexion as the Hindus themselves. Africans become lighter as they go up from the alluvial river banks to higher lands, or from the coast to the higher interior; and on the contrary, the coast tribes which drive out the Negroes of the interior and take their territory end by becoming Negroes themselves."

From such facts the inference is drawn that there is no fixity of human types, which disproves their origin in climatic conditions. If such changes could be produced in three centuries what might not be produced in one or two thousand years in the early history of our race? Moreover, it is shown that new species of animals make rapid changes and variations in their earlier history, and then the variations reach their limit, and subsequently remain so fixed as to suffer little further change.

This principle of nature applied to man would easily account for the early variations of the race, and their subsequent permanence. So it is concluded that it is not necessary to hold that God exercised His creative power in repeated creations of mankind. A single original creation was sufficient.

3. The following arguments are made in defense of this view.

(1) The race is one in physical characteristics. The distinctions are superficial and the result of environment. The oneness is; essential and fundamental, in all races, (a) In the chemical constitution of the human body, (b) In anatomical structure, (c) It is one in physiological constitution, (d) The body is one in pathological susceptibilities.

(2) Among all the races there is a similar psychological endowment. It is easy to point out a wide separation between a barbaric Negro and a cultured Caucasian, but there is nearly as wide a gulf of separation between the extremes of the Caucasian race that may be found in London within a few miles of each other. But still there is a oneness in all the intrinsic facts of mind. A person of any race has the same essential faculties, intellect, sensibility and will, a conscience and moral judgment, the same moral and religious nature.

(3) Prichard says: "We contemplate among all the diversified tribes of men, the same internal feelings, appetences, aversions; the same inward convictions, the same sentiment of subjection to invisible powers, and more or less fully developed of accountability to unseen avengers of wrong and agents of retributive justice, from whose tribunal men cannot even by death escape." They have a similar susceptibility for the great truths of the Gospel, the same intuition of the primary truths of reason. All these facts taken together constitute a powerful evidence of the unity of the race.

(4) "The sexual union of the most distinct races is just as fruitful as that within the purest and most definite race. The progeny of such union are entirely free from hybridity. Their fruitfulness is permanent and without decrease. Here are facts utterly unknown to all the crossings of animal species. It is only from the union of closely allied species that there is any produce. There is only the most limited fruitfulness of such offspring; never a permanent fruitfulness. This law of hybridity is entirely unknown among human races, and is unanswerable proof of the unity of the race, or of a single species of man. Hybrids are sterile" (Miley, Vol. I, pp. 379, 380). Were it not so, the scientific order, and at the same time the beautiful variety of nature could not be preserved, and the natural sciences would be impossible. Quaterfages concludes: "Thus in every case crossings between human groups exhibit the phenomena characteristic of mongrels and never those of hybrids. Now I wish that candid men, who are free from party spirit or prejudice, would follow me in this view, and study for themselves all these facts, a few of which I have only touched upon,

and I am perfectly convinced that they will, with the great men of whom I am only the disciple—with Linnaeus, Buffon, Lamarck, Cuvier, Geoffrey, Humboldt and Muller—arrive at the conclusion that all men belong to the same species, and that there is but one species of man."

(5) Comparative Philology leads to the same result. The existence of the same words in different languages is the proof of a primary connection and a common original. "Language," says Hodge, "is not a fortuitous production. It is essentially different from instinctive cries or inarticulate sounds. It is a production of the mind, exceedingly complex and subtle. It is impossible that races entirely distinct should have the same language. It is absolutely certain from the French, Spanish and Italian languages, that those nations are, in large measure, the common descendants of the Latin race. When therefore it can be shown that the languages of different races or varieties of men are radically the same, or derived from a common stock, it is impossible rationally to doubt their descent from a common ancestry. Unity of language, therefore, proves unity of species because it proves unity of origin." Alexander Von Humboldt says: "The comparative study of languages shows us that races now separated by vast tracts of lands, are allied together, and have migrated from one common primitive seat." Max Muller says: "The evidence of language is irrefragable, and it is the only evidence worth listening to, with regard to anti-historical periods. There is not an English jury nowadays which, after examining the hoary documents of language, would reject the claim of a common descent, and a legitimate relationship between Hindu, Greek, and Teuton." By the same infallible test Bunson shows that the Asiatic origin of all the North American Indians "is as fully proved as the unity of family among themselves."

A vast amount of such opinions might be quoted from those who have made this a study. "The only rational inference is that all human families were originally one family." "The universal affinity of language is placed in so strong a light that it must be considered by all as completely demonstrated" (Klaproth).

(6) There is also the argument drawn from the moral and spiritual condition of all men. This argument runs as follows: wherever we meet man of whatever tribe or people, we not only find that he has the same nature with ourselves; that he has the same organs, the same complement of faculties, the same senses, instincts, feelings, understanding, will and conscience, and the same capacity for religious culture, but we also find that he has the same guilty and polluted nature, the same consciousness of guilt and need of redemption. Nowhere on the face of the earth can men be found who are not oppressed by a sense of spiritual need, and are trying in some way to propitiate God. All men need the Gospel, and are capable of receiving the blessings which it offers. These facts demonstrate their common nature and their common origin beyond a reasonable doubt.

(7) In harmony with all these facts is the plain testimony of Scriptures. They teach and assume everywhere that the whole human race is lineally descended from Adam, and hence there is a genetic connection of all mankind. St. Paul declared: "He made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed seasons and the bounds of their habitation" (Acts 17: 26). This is a direct declaration that all the nations are the offspring of a common parentage. So the universal prevalence of sin and death are traced back to a common connection with Adam's sin; and all have a common relation to Christ, the second Adam. The great apostle's arguments in Romans and Corinthians are based on the unity of the race involving all men in a common relation to sin and grace. This is the unmistakable teaching of Scriptures. The

spiritual relationship of men, their common apostasy and their common interest in Christ demonstrate their common nature and their common origin from one common progenitor of all mankind.

* * * * *

CHAPTER II -- PRIMITIVE MAN -- NATURE OF MAN

We discuss man as the Scriptures introduce him to us, and as we now know him. Of the original man of evolution, a hairy beast with a tail and without a language, we have nothing to do. It is not proved that there ever was such a creature on the earth. Hence we dismiss him to the limbo of idle speculation.

The Scriptures tell us: "And Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."

I. This seems to be literal history. "When the style of a writing is purely historical, the contents must be accepted as literal, unless there be determining reasons for a different sense. This is a familiar and sound principle of interpretation." Murphy states it thus: "The direct or literal sense of a sentence is the meaning of the author, when no other is indicated; not any figurative, allegorical or mystical meaning" (Miley, Vol. I, p. 394). This is a perfectly natural interpretation of these opening chapters of Genesis. The narrative of the creation of man is no isolated section, but is interwoven with the rest of the Book. There is nothing to indicate that this is not as historical as the remainder. "No writer of true history," says Bishop Horsely, "would mix plain matter of fact with allegory in one continued narrative, without any intimation of a transition from one to the other. If, therefore, any part of this narrative be matter of fact, no part is allegorical. On the other hand, if any part be allegorical, no part is naked matter of fact." With a simple historic style and nothing to discredit an historical sense, we must adhere to the true historical character of this narrative. To say that the Author was writing a romance is to make the Bible inexplicable. We would be able to discover no rational account of its origin or purpose. But with a literal interpretation, it abounds in lessons of truth important to all mankind.

Jesus cited this story of Moses about the creation of Adam and Eve, in his teaching about divorce, as if it were simple, unadorned history. St. Paul repeatedly did the same. He referred to the order of their creation: "For Adam was first formed, then Eve" (1 Tim. 2: 13). "And Adam was not beguiled but the woman," verse 14. He tells us that the sin and the death came into the world through Adam (Rom. 5: 12-19). We are content to be in agreement with Jesus and the Apostle Paul.

II. The question then arises as to the constituent natures of man. On the face of the story of man's creation it is perfectly clear that man consists of at least two distinct principles or natures - a body and a soul, the one material and the other immaterial. The phenomena or properties of matter are essentially different and distinct from those of mind. To identify matter with mind is confusion of thought. It is contrary, also, to our innate intuitions. It is intuitively certain that matter and mind are two distinct substances; and such has been the commonsense decision of the great mass of mankind. It is at least certain that man is dichotomic, that is, has two distinct natures-body and

soul. Though he has a physical body like other animals, yet the chief distinction of man is his rational mind. In the one are found the common properties of matter; in the other such mental faculties and powers as 'prove the reality of spiritual being.

Scripture abundantly confirms this fact, universally known without the Scripture. "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it" (Ec. 12: 7). "And he will consume both soul and body" (Isa. 10: 18). "As for me, Daniel, my spirit was grieved in the midst of my body" (7: 15). "Fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matt. 10: 29).

But there is also scripture to support a TRICHOTOMIC nature in man. Trichotomy is the doctrine of three distinct natures in man - body, soul and spirit - soma, psuche, and pneuma. Body and spirit are discriminated as in the dichotomic division of natures. But psuche means a something different from either, and not easily defined. Dr. Bush, with others, calls it a tertium quid, and thinks it refers to the animal life in man, in distinction from the intellectual or rational life. President Dwight of Yale taught us that it designated "the animating principle of the body connected with the senses." Some think it may mean what faculties man shares with the lower animals, only possessing them in a higher degree, but excluding those which recognize and know God and moral accountability - in other words, those which relate us to God and the spirit realm.

At any rate Paul with his usual force and fulness of expression, speaking of the great blessing of sanctification as purifying the whole being, wrote: "And may your spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless" (1 Thess. 5: 23). Again, "The Word of God is living, and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit of both joints and marrow and quick to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart" (Heb. 4: 12). Here a distinction seems to be made between soul and spirit and "heart" would seem to include both. Again, "Thou shall love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy mind." Here again a distinction seems to be made between soul and mind. For centuries the early church at Alexandria, the great seat of Christian learning, held to the Trichotomic division.

Dr. Hodge contends for dichotomy. Dr. Miley after discussing dichotomic and trichotomic divisions of human nature, closes by saying, "We have reached no dogmatic conclusion on the question. Indeed, it does not seriously concern any important doctrine of Christian theology. It is a question of speculative interest in biblical psychology, but has no doctrinal implications decisive of either its truth or falsity."

III. As to the original physical constitution of man, we must conclude in the light of all the facts of human history, that it was substantially the same as our own. In chemical elements, in physiological constitution, in anatomical structure, the human body can not have materially changed. Then as now there were lungs for breathing, an alimentary system for the digestion and assimilation of food, veins and arteries for the circulation of blood, a nervous system for sensation and locomotion. Though absolutely perfect in form, and strength and health, he would be liable to accidents then as now. A fall over the precipice would break his bones, water might drown him, a falling rock might crush him, eating or drinking poison might poison him, the lightning bolt might strike him down. He would suffer from excess of fasting or eating." Such a bodily constitution is naturally liable to suffering and death. Any exemption would depend upon a specially providential

economy. Such an exemption was no doubt available for Adam on the condition of obedience to the divine will. In accord with these views, suffering and death are accounted to man through the sin of disobedience" (Miley, Vol. I, p. 403). President Dwight taught us that God would have had some wise way of getting people out of the world, to make room for others. It might have been by translation, or by painlessly falling asleep and waking in glory. But death as we know it, with all its-pain and agony of dissolving nature, and torture and dread, would have been unknown, had there been no sin.

As to Adam's mind, in number of faculties it was like our own. They had never been enfeebled or warped; or biased by the sins of a long line of ancestors or of his own. It is said of Themistocles that an ancient Greek teacher proposed to train his memory. "Teach me to remember!" he exclaimed. "I never forget anything now; I would rather you would teach me how to forget." It is reported of Lord Macauley that his memory retained everything and he declared that, if every copy of Milton's Poems were lost, he could reproduce every line of Paradise Lost from memory. If here and there a man now has such a memory, we may suppose that Adam's memory was perfect. If we could add to that a faultless reasoning power, and marvellous intuitions, and a perfect judgment, and remarkable perceptions and a corresponding imagination, all these faculties in a harmonious balance and combination, we might have some correct idea of what the first man was. Mr. Miley, however, thinks that theologians, prompted by John Milton, have been prone to exaggerate the greatness of Adam. He quotes South as saying: "An Aristotle was but the rubbish of an Adam." And, Wesley that, "Adam reasoned with unerring accuracy if he reasoned at all." This supposes that he possessed immediate insight into all subjects, and was in no need of experience or reasoning or study as a means of knowledge. This may be an overestimate of the primitive man. "No doubt," says Miley, "he possessed a faculty of immediate insight into primary truths; but there is no evidence of any such insight into truths which we can acquire only through experience and reasoning. We may concede him a very high grade of mental powers, yet they were merely human just like our own in kind, and operative under the same laws" (p. 404).

As to his language, very likely God gave him a language of reasonable fullness and sufficient vocabulary ready made. The use of language is not acquired by intuition but by practice. How much God taught Adam by inspiration or communion with him, we know not. But by the common agreement of the best thinkers the origination of language is a difficult and slow problem; not a few have found its sufficient source only in the divine agency. The proper naming of only a limited number of birds and beasts would require more knowledge 'than our first parent could possibly have had, if dependent solely on himself. "It is hardly thinkable that such intuition can belong to any finite mind." To suppose that Adam possessed an intuitive knowledge of the structure and nature of the fauna and flora of his locality, so that he could give appropriate names to each creature puts him out of all relation with ourselves. "Either he must from the first have been able to distinguish them by their characteristic marks and leading properties, and to have distinct notions of them annexed to their several appellations, or that he applied sounds at random, as names of the animals, without such notions. But the latter is to suppose a jargon, not a language; and the former implies a miraculous operation on the mind of Adam" (Magee).

It is far more rational to think our first parent was divinely helped to that knowledge and language which prepared him to rule the world.

IV. Adam was made "in the image of God." What is the real significance of such language? It could scarcely mean less than that he had a moral nature like God's. To know God man must have similar faculties and attributes, otherwise it would be impossible. To owe duty to God man must be a moral being. To be a moral being there must be the possession of moral faculties, which are INTELLECT, SENSIBILITY and FREE WILL. These are the invariable attributes of personality. No being, not possessed of these, is a person in the eyes of law, human or divine.

1. The intellect. By this we mean the power of perceiving and knowing, embracing all the various faculties of sense, judgment, memory imagination and reason. In this discussion we chiefly concern ourselves with the REASON because of its bearing on theology.

a. By this attribute come to us all the necessary truths; such as, the knowledge of our own personal existence, identity and free agency. Self-consciousness is the condition and guarantee of all knowledge. Reason gives us the axioms of mathematics, the ideas of time and space; of causation and obligation. These ideas or principles are the necessary truths, because they are seen directly to be true of necessity. No sane man can call some things in question. There is a consciousness within us, a self-knowing, self-judging function of our rational being by which we know our own acts and states. This includes a distinction between ourselves, the knower, and the outer world which we know; also a distinction between our own mind, the thinker, and the body which we inhabit. The reason says, "I am spirit-not matter." It distinguishes itself from its own body and from the outer world.

b. "Right reason recognizing itself as law is conscience" (Harris). It says, "I ought," or "I ought not." It has a sense of duty, of obligation to a superior Being from which it cannot escape, which holds man accountable at least for his choices. This faculty makes man a law to himself in all his voluntary, intelligent actions. He can no more escape from moral obligation than he can deny his identity, or annihilate himself. Wuttke said, "It is not so much the person who has the conscience but the conscience which has the person." "Two things fill me with awe, the starry heavens, and the sense of moral responsibility in man" (Kant). "There is a spectacle grander than the ocean, and that is the conscience. There is a spectacle grander than the sky, and it is the interior of the soul" (V. Hugo).

The terms right and wrong, or kindred words, are in all languages, because the idea of right and wrong is in every soul. We charge ourselves and others with doing right or wrong from our earliest youth, and throughout life. We do it in pleasure, in business, in society, in family life, in civil government, in uncivilized society, in literature and religion. We never cease doing it, and we cannot help doing it. "It is by this faculty that we say 'must' and 'ought'; there is no must or ought to the brute; it has a kind of intelligence, a spiritual nature in some form; but not having reason it cannot know obligation nor God. Hence it cannot be a moral or religious being" (Fairchild). This is what makes us "rational beings," in distinction from the lower animals.

c. This gives us the real knowledge of God. If something within us (reason) affirms accountability, it is accountability to a SOME ONE-God. Conscience speaks in God's name and forbids man to be a God to himself. It presumes the being of God-a righteous being who will ratify the verdicts of conscience. We know God by intuition and conscience. We cannot reason at all without assuming a God. We cannot help assuming a regular order, a supreme intelligence, a designing mind, if not a

moral end or purpose in advance of all reasoning. Mansell declares: "Man learns to pray before he learns to reason; he feels within him the consciousness of a Supreme Being, and the instinct of worship, before he can argue from effects to causes." "Self-consciousness and world-consciousness can only find their completion in God-consciousness" (Dorner). "Men do not reach their belief in God by argument but without it" (Calderwood). "Not by arguments without but by the breath of God within us, do we get our first impression of the divine existence" (F. L. Patton). "There is that in man which makes him restless without God, discontented with every substitute for him" (Fisher). "In proportion as the conscience is quickened, it is natural that men should believe in a personal God, who judges them and who will punish and reward them" (Wace). "Through self-knowledge man comes to the knowledge of God. There can be no true conception of conscience which does not affirm the being of God" (Mulford).

Thus it is that this great faculty of reason, as intuition and conscience, by these fundamental first principles, lays the foundation of science and theology. It is a peculiarity of these truths of the reason that they are known to be true by their own nature. Nobody stops to prove them to anybody else. Their truth is assumed. We call them necessary truths, and believe them without any argument, and assume that everybody else believes them.

d. It is another peculiarity of the reason that much of its results have the character of inevitableness. This is true also of the action of what is commonly called the intellect. We cannot help thinking that two and two are four; that we ourselves exist; that we are different from the bodies we inhabit and from the material world around us; that right is right and wrong is wrong, and the two are not the same; that there is a God and we ought to obey Him; that we ought to do right and ought not to do wrong. We cannot help thinking that white is white and not black, or that a horse is before us in the street when we see him. We can give our attention to one object and not to another; we can determine the direction of our thoughts in a degree, but not the nature of the thought in the presence of the object. Hence we have only an indirect responsibility for our thoughts.

2. THE SENSIBILITY.

a. Through our sentient nature or sensibility we become aware of good and evil in the matter of pleasure and pain, satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Indeed, good and evil can have no existence except on condition of a sensibility. If our intellects were metallic calculating machines without the power of feeling, there could be no such thing as duty or obligation, because there could be no pleasure or pain. President Fairchild well said: "If there were no sentient being, there could be no good or evil in the universe-nothing of ultimate value-nothing to be chosen or regarded as a desirable end -an object to be chosen for its own sake; hence there could be no obligation, no end to be chosen, no course of conduct which ought to be pursued; hence no right or wrong as moral facts, and no ideas corresponding with the words 'right' and 'wrong,' 'ought' and 'ought not.' We never say ought or ought not except in regard to some natural good-some interest; and all good, all interest lies in the condition or experience of a sentient nature. The sensibilities are the channel for the ideas of good and evil, and thus it is the condition of the apprehension of obligation. Obligation is perceived by the reason in view of the good or happiness given by the sensibility. Hence one cannot be a moral being without a sentient nature" (Theology, p. 35).

b. The actions of the sensibility take the various forms of desires, appetites, affections, passions and emotions. All these except the emotions are related to something outside of us, the attainment of which affords satisfaction. These objects as producing satisfaction are a relative good, but the satisfaction is the good itself. Fruit on a tree, ripe and luscious, is a relative good-good to delight and sustain man; but the sustenance and satisfaction of man, his delight derived from the fruit is absolute good-the real good in itself.

It is this happiness which man receives that constitutes the motive to human action and all man's achievement. Without this sentient nature man would not take enough interest in himself to feed himself or care for himself or keep himself alive, or propagate the race. The sentient nature affords the continual spur to enterprise, and pushes the race along in the path of advancement and progress.

It is through our sensibilities that God himself appeals to us, that is, by the bliss of heaven and the pangs of hell. Without our sentient nature there could be no bliss and no pangs, and no motive to right action. Heaven itself as we think of it would be an impossibility. Thus it will be seen what a part the sensibilities play in the destiny of moral beings.

c. The emotions in themselves are passive experiences, depending upon the conditions that excite them, and are only indirectly motives to action. The emotions of fear may bring pain and the pain is a motive; so indirectly the emotion itself is a motive.

The movements of the sensibility in their higher forms, depend upon some special apprehensions of the mind. The emotions arise in the presence of the exciting causes; hence the causes must be present to perception or thought. The sight of the Alps may awaken the emotion of sublimity; the thought of them might do the same. So far as we know the lower animals are not moved by beauty, grandeur, sublimity, or moral excellence, and have no corresponding emotions.

d. It will be seen at once that the sensibility acts inevitably by a law of necessity. We cannot avoid desiring the object correlated to our sensibility. A hungry man cannot help desiring food when he sees it, and smells it. A thirsty man has no option whether he will desire water or not, when he sees it. The thirsty coffee drinker is moved by the fragrance of coffee, and the drunkard by the odor of his favorite drink. The sensibility waits for no permission to be excited. We cannot well avoid having the emotions which objects of sense or thought are calculated to excite. We can often decide ' what our eyes shall see and our ears shall hear, and what subjects shall occupy our thoughts, and thus indirectly we can decide the character of our desires and emotions, but only indirectly. It would follow, therefore, that in-so-far as our feelings and desires and emotions are inevitable no moral character attaches to them. Thus a moral philosopher, very judicious in statement writes: "We do not strictly speak of these emotions or desires as morally right or! wrong, but as pleasant or painful, as desirable or undesirable, helpful or harmful. Even an artificial appetite, craving a harmful indulgence, like the love of strong drink, is not wrong in a moral sense; what are sometimes called the malevolent affections, like anger, resentment, which impel us to do harm to the objects which excite them, are not morally wrong. A yielding to them may be wrong; the action to which they tend to move us may be wrong; nursing these passions, giving them place and encouragement in our hearts may be wrong, but, strictly, the wrong is not in the movement of the sensibility itself."¹ 1. Fairchild's Theology, pp. 36, 37.

e. It will be seen from the foregoing that the sensibility is of indispensable value to us. It makes us moral beings. It gives us the whole realm of motives. It spurs us to action, and inspires our efforts; it makes blessedness possible both here and hereafter. But while it is thus a source of good, it also is the source of temptation. All evil makes its appeal here. And here we get an insight into the nature of sin. It is the consent of the will to obey the sensibility instead of living a life of obedience to enlightened reason. "A life controlled by the sensibility is a life which befits a brute. A life ordered by reason, against impulse and feeling if need be, is a life which befits man," the child of God. Which of the two lives we shall live is decided by the FREE WILL.

3. THE FREEDOM OF THE WILL.

The question of the freedom of the will is one of profound importance. It is as old as human philosophy. It will be noticed that the will is only one of the three great moral attributes of man. So strictly speaking, it is the freedom of the moral being, who possesses the attribute of will, that we are discussing. The attribute of will belongs to an agent. The mind, or soul, or spiritual being is the active, intelligent agent to whom the powers of free moral action belong; the will is the mind acting as it freely elects to act. The question, then, under consideration is WHETHER MAN IS A FREE MORAL AGENT. The terms should be defined.

(1) An agent is an actor, one who puts forth acts.

(2) A moral agent is one who puts forth acts that have a moral bearing to them—acts that are related to duty and moral obligation, and affect the moral character and destiny of immortal beings.

(3) A free moral agent is one whose moral choices, which lead to acts, are not necessitated by any internal or external compulsion. By internal compulsion is meant previous character or a previous act of volition, or previous state of mind, or desires, or habits, or natural appetences. By external compulsion is meant any effect of motives, or the influence of other beings. Now if a moral being is not thus free to originate his choices, independent of all compulsion from within or from without, then he is not a moral being at all. His actions can be neither virtuous nor vicious, worthy of praise or deserving of blame.

A free moral agent, then, be it understood, is one who can originate—moral choices, freely, deliberately, voluntarily, in view of motives, and enlightened by a sense of duty and obligation. Moral freedom, then, is an attribute of personality. It is the power of rational self-energizing with respect to ends. For such agency there must be a rational conception of the ends of action; a power of reflection and judgment upon ends and motives, and of rationally determining our action in respect to them. Such a power belongs only to moral beings, and the freedom lies not in the constituent faculties of our personality, but in our power of freely using them in personal action. The possession of such power cannot be consistently denied by any who admit the existence of virtue and vice, or who believe that man is an accountable being. The two facts are correlated and must stand or fall together.

The difference between the working of the will and the movements of the intellect and sensibilities becomes apparent. The actions of the intellect and sensibility we found to a degree to be inevitable. Not so with the action of the will. Here all is freedom, if there is any responsibility.

We are conscious of at least two courses of action possible to us; there may be many. They severally present their advantages and disadvantages, attractions and repulsions; and we consciously determine for ourselves by a free choice between them, which course we will pursue. Consciousness affirms that it is not a matter of thought or feeling, though both of these are involved, but the use of a faculty different from either. It is a conscious determination we make of the course we will pursue by the use of our faculty of choice or will.

In this decision we are conscious of the fact of freedom or liberty. We know that we can will to take either of the attitudes or pursue either of the courses open to us; nothing can persuade us otherwise. In spite of all the befogging speculations of theologians and philosophers, this is something that is infallibly known by the common sense of mankind. We are conscious of being self-sovereigns; in forming our decisions of the will, and to this extent we are free.

Let it be carefully observed, that our freedom may go no further. Something may prevent us from carrying the decision of the will into execution. A burglar decides to rob a bank; the policeman, prevents him from carrying his purpose into actual execution, but the deed was performed, morally when the purpose was formed.-The decision of the will is the deed. Forty men bound themselves; by an oath to murder St. Paul. The Roman government prevented; them. But in the eye of moral reason they were all murderers, as truly as if they had been permitted to execute their murderous-design. The real freedom of man begins and ends with the formation of the purpose. We cannot surely and absolutely and directly determine any result outside of or beyond the simple decision of the will itself. If our constitution, mental and physical, is in order, and there is no outside impediment, action will naturally follow the decision of the will. But many hindrances may come in to prevent the execution of the freely formed purpose. Over the results we have no direct and absolute control. We are free in the forming of the purpose. Here moral freedom properly speaking ends. But this is ample to give us a basis for man's moral character, and" God's moral government.

* * * * *

CHAPTER III -- MAN'S MORAL AGENCY

All the various theories of the will properly fall under two general classes-that of necessity on the one hand, and that of free agency on the other. Dr. Hodge makes three general classes-necessity, contingency, and certainty. He does this to conceal from himself and others the necessitarianism of his own scheme of thought.

I. The various schemes of necessity are the following:

1. The doctrine of fatalism. This teaches that all events are determined by a blind necessity. Under the sway of fate all things are necessarily determined; so that they could not but be as they are. Fate binds all things in the equal chains of necessity, also all events and all intelligences-God, angels and men, and all their thoughts, feelings and plans-(if there be any angels or any God). This theory precludes the idea of foresight or plan, or of the voluntary selection of an end, and the adoption of means for its accomplishment. Things are as they are, and must be as they are, and are to be, without any rational cause. Whatever may be the cause of events the stars or blind force or the

constitution of things, the theory leaves no room for liberty of action, and reduces the acts of men to the level of the acts of the lower animals. Speaking exactly, fatalism refers everything to blind fate.

2. There is the mechanical theory. This denies that man is the efficient cause of his own acts. It represents man as passive, or as endued with no higher form of activity than spontaneity. It avowedly precludes the idea of responsibility. The inward state of man and his outward acts are determined by his circumstances.

3. Much akin to the latter is materialism. From its nature it must be necessitarian. The forces of nature operate inevitably under a law of necessity. If everything is matter, there can be, of course, no free self-determining spirit.

4. Pantheism is a doctrine of necessity. "In pantheism God is the totality of being, and works from a necessity of his nature without consciousness, intelligence or aim. Finite existences, including man, are mere modes of himself, and the product of his aimless activity. Hence man, as the mode of a being subject to a law of absolute necessity, could not have freedom of action in himself" (Jouffroy, "Introduction to Ethics," Vol. I, p. 193).

5. A fifth form of necessity includes all the schemes which supersede the efficiency of second causes and refer everything to God. All efficiency is in God. Matter and mind are alike passive. All the changes of nature, and all the actions of man are due to God's immediate operation.

One form of this doctrine is that the agency of God in the preservation of the world is a continuous creation. But if God creates the physical world at each successive moment then he is the immediate cause of all its changes. Likewise, if He recreates man each successive second, then God would alone be responsible for whatever man feels or thinks or plans or purposes. Let us illustrate. One second God created Cain getting angry at his brother Abel; the next second He created him seizing a club; and third second God created him swinging it madly through the air; the fourth He created him smashing his brother's skull. Then God calls to Cain: "Where is thy brother Abel?" The absurdity of such a doctrine is only equaled by its blasphemy.

Closely allied with this doctrine is "the exercise scheme" which teaches that "the soul is a series of exercises created by God." These experiences follow each other with amazing rapidity. Dr. Nathaniel Emmons said God creates them. Of course, then, it is vain to speak of the liberty of man in producing the creative acts of God. If He creates the decisions of man's will in view of motives, then they are His acts and not ours, and He alone would be responsible. President Mahan tells us that Dr. Lyman Beecher visited Dr. Emmons in his old age and said to him: "I understand that you teach that all the actions and experiences of the soul are the direct creation of God." "I so teach," said Dr. Emmons. "Well I cannot understand," said Beecher, "and will you kindly explain to me how it is that, if God creates all these actions of the soul, He forbids sin, and is angry at it, and calls on heaven and earth to witness His grieved surprise when men do sin?" A blank look came over Dr. Emmons's face; his head dropped; he put his hand to his embarrassed brow; his gifted tongue was silent. The utter foolishness of his life-long theory, which he had taught to a hundred preachers at last dawned on this great Calvinist's mind. It made him speechless; and Lyman Beecher was too much of a gentleman to press his questions further.

6. The Calvinistic doctrines of predestination, divine sovereignty and monergism involve necessity. Many predestinarians deny this; but others admit it, and are logically the more consistent. Absolute decrees must have their effectuation in the divine agency as Dr. Hodge declares

7. The Calvinistic doctrine that motives must determine our volitions and choices and that choice must go with the strongest motive, is also a doctrine of necessity. It is often called philosophical or moral necessity. Akin to it is the doctrine of moral inability to do good. All these views end in the same conclusion, that man does what he does from necessity, and is not a free moral agent.

We will now examine the teaching of President Edwards and Dr. Hodge, as specimen writers of Calvinism.

II. PRESIDENT EDWARDS' DOCTRINE. This great and good man had a philosophical mind of the first order, and was a subtle reasoner and thinker. But he has led multitudes into error by his erroneous teaching on this great subject. Professedly he was writing about "The Freedom of the Will," and consequent "human accountability." But singularly enough, as his definitions, and discussion and conclusions show, he missed the subject entirely and advocated a system of blank necessity.

1. His definition of the freedom of the will was utterly fallacious. He defines it as, "the power, opportunity, or advantage one has to do as he pleases. Or, in other words, his being free from hindrance or impediment in the way of doing or conduction in any respect as he wills." "Let the person come by his volition or choice how he will." (Let it happen without a cause, or be the result of a previous state of mind or volition, or be necessitated by a motive or be produced by a direct act of God Almighty; "yet if he is able, and there is nothing in the way to hinder his pursuing and executing his will, the man is fully and perfectly free, according to the primary and common notion of freedom."

Now the reader will notice that this definition does not even refer to the question how the decision of the will came to be made, but only refers to the carrying out of the choice after it has been made. His definition of natural ability wholly excludes the power to will, and includes only the power or ability to execute the volition or choice of will after it is made. Thus it is evident that natural ability with Edwards respects external action only and has nothing whatever to do with -willing. It refers only to the external action of the body in carrying out the decision of the will. Therefore, of course, his natural ability has no relation to morality or immorality, sin or holiness. This was Edwards' fundamental error that is woven into his whole system.

2. A second error is that he always confounds desire with volition or the act of will, making them the same thing. Edwards regarded the mind as possessing but two primary faculties-the will and the understanding. He confounded all states of the sensibility with acts of will, and since the movement of the sensibility on certain conditions is inevitable, therefore he concluded that the action of the will was inevitable.

"I have chosen to express myself thus, that the will is always as the greatest apparent good is, or what appears most agreeable. If strict propriety of speech be insisted on, it may more probably be said, that the voluntary action, which is the immediate consequence of the mind's choice, is determined by that which appears most agreeable rather than by the choice itself." The strongest desire with him is always identical with volition or choice. He says, "By whatever name we call the act of the will, choosing, refusing, approving, disapproving, liking, disliking, embracing, rejecting, determining, directing, commanding, forbidding, inclining, or being averse, being pleased or displeased with, all may be reduced to this of choosing." Thus liking and being pleased with, and willing are, with him, all the same.

He defends it by saying, "I humbly conceive that the affections of the soul are not properly distinguished from the will, as though there were two faculties." "All acts of the will are truly acts of the affections." Thus this great metaphysician, by confounding things that are perfectly distinct in nature, was led to adopt views respecting the human will which are contrary to truth, full of obscurity and self-contradictory.

3. His third error was that motive determines the will. "If objects of desire have no tendency to move the will in a particular direction, they are not, properly speaking, motives. If they have such a tendency, they must actually move the will, provided there is nothing which has a tendency to move it in a different direction. When on one side there is no influence, any influence on the other side must turn the scale." This is true of the sensibility; but it is not true of the will, as we shall show later.

4. The fourth error of Edwards was that choice is always decided by the strongest motive. He says: "It is sufficient to my present purpose to say, it is that motive which, as it stands in view of the mind, is the strongest that determines the will." "It is also evident, from what has been before proved, that the will is always, and in every individual act, necessarily determined by the strongest! motive; and so is always unable to go against the motive which, all things considered, has now the greatest strength and advantage to move the will." Now it is perfectly manifest that there can be no freedom of will, if its choices and decisions "must be" "necessarily determined" by anything but itself. If one asks proof of all this domination of the strongest motive none whatever is given. He and all the thinkers of his school simply affirm that "motive controls ' choice and the determination must be according to the law of comparative strength." It never occurs to them that there is any power \ in man to give weight to a motive, or to set it wholly aside. It is -only the merest assertion that the strongest motive "must certainly rule." With such an absolute domination of motive, there would be no possible escape from the absolutest necessitation of choice. The will would be no more free than a weathervane, or the mercury of a thermometer. If the south wind blows the strongest it points to the south and if the north wind is strongest, it veers to the north. If the heat influence is stronger, the mercury goes up; if the cold is stronger the mercury falls. So would it be with the will.

5. A fifth error of Edwards and all his school of thinkers is that they assume that the physical law of cause and effect rules in the realm of mind, just as it does in the realm of matter. They seek for a cause for man's decisions and choices of will. It never seems to dawn on their minds, that the mind itself is an original fountain of causation in the universe. They find all causes in previous states of mind, character, habit, depravity, external influences, circumstances, etc., which they call

MOTIVES, and the strongest motive must rule. Of course it landed Edwards, as it does all his followers, in a scheme of absolute necessity. The steps were few.

(1) The theory asserts the domination of motive.

(2) The theory admits of no power over motive.

(3) It denies the intervention of personal agency. Any motive state consistent with the theory must be purely spontaneous, and must immediately determine the volitional result, and such a result must be a necessity.

Thus the theory assumes that choice has a cause, and that motive is the only cause. There can be but one logical result to such a theory; it denies the power of personal agency over motive, and of course necessity lies in the very notion of the causal relation of motive to choice. "Choice must have a cause; motive is the only possible cause; therefore motive must determine the choice." The sovereign power of mind to originate its own choice is wholly overlooked.

The irresistible logical inferences to be drawn from such a course of reasoning, are truly amazing. Miley states them graphically as follows: "A law of necessity has determined all human volitions. Not a single choice could have been avoided or in the least varied; not one could have been added to the actual number. We are the passive subjects of spontaneous impulses, and are without any true personal agency, rational or moral. There must be the same determining law, also, for all other finite intelligences, and even for God himself. In all the realm of mind a law of necessity reigns.

Of all actual volitions, good and evil, none could have been avoided; nor could one have been added. It must be in the future as it has been in the past. Necessity is the universal and eternal law!"

To such a monstrous conclusion does Jonathan Edwards' famous discussion of the freedom of the will directly lead. Then he discusses natural ability and natural inability and moral inability and rings all the possible combinations and permutations and changes upon them, until he runs himself and all his followers into dense fogbanks of misconception and delusion and error. President Finney followed Edwards through all his sinuous arguments and relentlessly exhibited his fallacies.

1. Finney showed that Edwards' natural ability was no ability at all, since it referred only to the ability to execute the choice when made, but had nothing whatever to do with originating the choice. Said Finney: "If we have not the power to will, we have not the power or ability to do anything. All ability or power to do resides in the will, and power to will is the necessary condition of ability to do. In morals and religion the willing is the doing. The power to will is the condition of obligation to do. The soul has no other faculty whereby it can, in a direct and proper sense, comply with any command of God but the faculty of will; and it is by this faculty only that the soul can directly disobey or refuse compliance. Even Edwards himself admitted that the will was the executive faculty, and that the soul can do nothing except as it wills to do it, and that for this reason a command to do is strictly a command to will." "It is enough to say," said Finney, "that it is absurd and sheer nonsense to talk of an ability to do when there is no ability to will. But let it

be distinctly understood that ability to will entered not at all into Edwards' idea and definition of natural ability. His ability is no ability at all, and nothing but an empty name, a metaphysico-theological fiction."

2. Notice what according to Edwards constituted natural inability. He said: "We are said to be naturally unable to do a thing when we cannot do it if we will, because what is most commonly called nature does not allow it; or because of some impeding defect or obstacle that is extrinsic to the will." This shows that Edwards' natural inability had nothing to do with willing but only with the effects of willing. That is to say, his natural inability also referred only to outward action or doing, but had nothing whatever to do with the ability to originate a volition.

3. "This natural inability," declared Finney, "is not inability at all." By this is intended that, so far as morals and religion are concerned, the willing is the doing, and therefore when the willing actually takes place, the real thing required or prohibited is already done." Edwards says: "If the will fully complies and the proposed effect does not prove, according to the laws of nature, to be connected with his volition, the man is perfectly excused; he has a natural inability to do the thing required."

Finney replies: "Here, then, it is manifest, that the Edwardean notions of natural ability and inability have no connection with moral law or moral government, and, of course, with morals and religion. That the Bible everywhere accounts the willing as the deed, is most manifest. Both as it respects sin and holiness, if the required or prohibited act of the will takes place the moral law and the Lawgiver regard the deed as having been done, or the sin committed, whatever impediment may have prevented the natural effect from following." "It is truly, amazing that Edwards could have written the paragraph just quoted and many more like it without perceiving the fallacy and absurdity of his speculation, - without seeing that the ability or inability about which he was writing had no connection with morals or religion."

4. Finney urges with great power, that natural ability is identical with freedom of will and that man has the natural ability to obey God.

(1) He contends that moral obligation respects strictly only acts of will; (2) that willing is the doing required by the true spirit of the moral law. Ability, therefore, to will in accordance with the moral law, must be natural ability to obey God, but, (3), this is and must be the only proper freedom of the will so far as morals and religion or moral law are concerned. In other words, true freedom or liberty of will must consist in the power or ability to will in every instance in accordance with, or in opposition to moral obligation. For moral obligation respects acts of will. Edwards himself holds that ability to do is indispensable to liberty. Natural ability and natural liberty to will, must then be identical.

Let this be distinctly remembered, for many have scouted the doctrine of natural ability to obey God, who have nevertheless been great sticklers for the freedom of the will. In this they are greatly inconsistent. The ability is called a natural ability, because it belongs to man as a moral agent, in such a sense that without it he could not be a proper subject of command, of reward or punishment. That is, without this liberty or ability, he could not be a moral agent, and a proper subject of moral government. He must then either possess this power in himself as essential to his own nature, or

must be able to avail himself of power to will in every instance in accordance with moral obligation. Whatever he can do he can do only by willing; he must therefore either possess the power in himself directly to will as God commands, or he must be able by willing to avail himself of power, and to make himself willing. If he has such power by nature to will directly as God requires, or by willing to avail himself of power' so to will, then he is naturally free and able to obey the commandments of God. Then let it be borne distinctly in mind, that natural ability, about which so much has been said is nothing more or less than the freedom or liberty of the will of a moral agent.

5. Since the human will is free, men have power or ability to do all their duty. The moral government of God everywhere assumes and implies the liberty of the human will, and the natural ability of men to obey God. Every command, every threatening, every exhortation and denunciation in the Bible implies and assumes this. Nor does the Bible do violence to the human intelligence in this assumption; for the human mind necessarily assumes the freedom of the human will as a first truth. The first truths, let it be remembered, are those that are necessarily assumed by every moral agent. They are assumed always and necessarily by the law of the intelligence. In all our judgments respecting our own moral character and that of others, we always and necessarily assume the liberty of the human will, or natural ability to obey God. The very ideas of right and wrong, of the praiseworthiness and blameworthiness of human beings, imply the assumption on the part of those who have these ideas of the universal freedom of the human will, or of the natural ability of men as moral agents to obey God. I know that philosophers and theologians have in theory denied the doctrine of natural ability or liberty in the sense in which I have defined it; and I know, too, that with all their theorizing, they did assume, in common with all other men, that man is free in the sense that he has liberty or power to will as God commands. I know that, but for this assumption, the human mind could no more predicate praiseworthiness or blameworthiness, right or wrong of man, than it could of the motions of a windmill. But the fact is, that in all cases the assumption has lain deep in the mind as a first truth, that all men are free in the sense of being naturally able to obey God; and this assumption is a necessary condition of the affirmation that moral character belongs to man."

6. Let us hear Edwards on his moral inability. He defines it thus: "We are said to be naturally unable to do a thing when we cannot do it if we will, because of some impeding defect or obstacle that is extrinsic to the will as constitution of the body or external objects. But moral inability consists not in any of these things but either in a want of inclination, or the want of sufficient motives in view, to induce and excite the act of the will, or the strength of apparent motives to the contrary. Or both these may be resolved into one, and it may be said in one word that moral inability consists in the opposition or want of inclination." Now let it be remembered that according to Edwards, the acts of will are necessitated by motives. He says: "If every act of will is excited by a motive, then that motive is the cause of the act. If the acts of the will are excited by motives, then motives are the causes of their being excited; or, which is the same thing, the cause of their existence. And if so, the existence of the acts of the will is properly the effect of their motives." Hence, according to Edwards, man is unable to obey God when, 1. There is a want of such motives as would compel him to obey, or, 2. When there are present such motives as compel him to disobey. In other words, inability to obey God, consists in a want of the inclination, choice, desire, or sense of the most agreeable that God requires, or in an inclination, or existing choice,

volition, or sense of the most agreeable which is opposed to the requirement of God, or, what is the same thing, a wicked spirit of disobedience.

Finney says: "Here is the great error of Edwards. He assumes that no agent whatever, not even God himself, possesses a power of self-determination; that the will of God and of all moral agents is determined not by themselves but by an objective motive. If they will in one direction or another, it is not from any free and sovereign self-determination in view of motives, but because the motives or inducements present to the mind, inevitably produce or necessitate the sense of the most agreeable, or choice. If this is not fatalism or natural necessity, what is?"

Edwards' moral inability is the only natural inability that has anything to do with duty, morality or religion. His present moral inability to obey is identical with present disobedience, with a natural inability to obey. It is amazing to see how so great and good a man could involve himself in a metaphysical fog, and bewilder himself and his readers to such a degree, that an absolutely senseless distinction should pass into the current phraseology, philosophy, and theology of the church, and a score of theological dogmas be built upon the assumption of its truth. This nonsensical distinction has been in the mouth of the Edwardean school of theology, from Edwards' day to the present. Both saints and sinners have been bewildered and, I must say, abused by it. Men have been told that they are as really unable to will as God directs, they were to create themselves; and when it is replied that this inability excuses the sinner, we are directly silenced by the assertion, that this is only a moral inability, or an inability of will and therefore, that it is so far from excusing the sinner, that it constitutes the very ground and substance, and whole of his guilt. Indeed! Men are under moral obligation only to will as God directs. But an inability thus to will, consisting in the absence of such motives as would necessitate the required choice, or the presence of such motives as to necessitate an opposite choice, as a moral inability, and really constitutes the sinner worthy of an exceeding great and eternal weight of damnation! Ridiculous! EDWARDS I REVERE; HIS BLUNDERS I DEPLORE.

I speak thus of this Treatise on the Will, because while it abounds with unwarrantable assumptions, distinctions without a difference, and metaphysical subtleties, it has been adopted as the text-book of a multitude of what are called Calvinistic divines for scores of years. It has bewildered the head, and greatly embarrassed the heart and the action of the Church of God. It is time, high time, that its errors should be exposed, and so exploded that such phraseology should be laid aside, and the ideas which these words represent should cease to be entertained" (Finney's Theology, pp 320-333).

III. CHARLES HODGE'S DOCTRINE.

He tries to lay for his argument a good foundation, as if conscious of having a large contract on hand.

1. He sets forth to suit himself the doctrine of Contingency as opposed to necessity. He says: "Sometimes it is called the liberty of indifference; by which is meant that, the will, at the moment of decision, is self-poised among conflicting motives, and decides in one way or the other, not because of the greater influence of one motive over others, but because it is indifferent or undetermined, able to act in accordance with the weaker against the stronger motive, and even without any motive

at all. Sometimes this doctrine is expressed by the phrase, self-determining power of the will. By this it is intended to deny that the will is determined by motives, and affirm that the reason of its decisions is to be sought in itself. It is a cause and not an effect, and therefore requires nothing out of itself to account for its acts.

Sometimes this doctrine is called the power of contrary choice; that is, that in every volition there is and must be power to contrary. Even supposing all antecedents external and internal to have been precisely the same, the decision might have been the reverse of what it actually was. Contingency is therefore necessary to liberty. A contingent event is one that may or may not happen. Contingence, therefore, is opposed not merely to necessity, but also to certainty. (Not true.) If a man may act in opposition to all motives, external and internal, and in despite of all influence which can be exerted on him, short of destroying his liberty, then it must forever remain uncertain how he will act. The advocates of his theory of liberty, therefore, maintain, that the will is independent of reason, of feeling, and of God.

"Although the advocates of the liberty of contingency generally direct their arguments against the doctrine of necessity, yet it is apparent that they regard certainty no less than necessity to be inconsistent with liberty" (Vol. II, pp. 282, 283).

We may pause here to remark that (1), this last statement is not true. Ralston says in his *Theology*, p. 25, "If the term contingent in this controversy, has any definite meaning at all, as applied to the moral actions of man, it must mean their freedom, and stands opposed, not to certainty, but to necessity. A free action is a voluntary one; and an action which results from the choice of the agent is distinguished from a necessary one in this, that it might not have been, or might have been otherwise, according to the self-determining power of the agent. It is with reference to this specific quality of a free action that the term contingency is used—it might have been otherwise. In other words, it was not necessitated. Contingency in moral actions is, therefore their freedom, and is opposed, not to certainty, but to necessity. The question is not about the certainty of moral actions, that is, whether they will happen or not, but about the nature of them, whether free or Constrained, whether they must happen or not."

We could quote many other Arminian writers to this effect. We are aware that some Arminians, in their zeal to defend the freedom of the will, have very unwisely denied the certainty of the future actions of moral beings, and thus have played into the hands of their opponents. But Dr. Hodge ought to have known that Arminians do not, as a class, deny the certainty of future actions of men. They are contingent with us, but are all certain to God. How he knows them is beyond our understanding.

(2) It is perfectly plain from this single quotation from Dr. Hodge, just where his discussion will end. He is going to deny that man is "self-poised among conflicting motives," and deny the "self-determining power of the will," and deny "the power of contrary choice," and make man the helpless victim of causes and motives over which he has no possible control. When a man comes to the fork of the road and chooses the right-hand fork, he could not have chosen the left-hand road to save his life, for according to Hodge there is "no power of contrary choice." A man goes to the store and reflects whether he will buy a pound of tea or a pound of coffee. He buys tea. According to Hodge he could not, by any possibility, have bought coffee instead, because "the external and

He says, page 295, "When we say that an agent is self-determined, we say two things. (1) That he is the author or efficient cause of his own act. (2) That the grounds or reasons of his determination are within himself. He is determined by what constitutes him at the moment a particular individual, his feelings, principles, character, dispositions," (and the motives, "which are truly causes and determine" the will, according to this author).

President Fairchild answers this point in the following words: "It is a very prevalent doctrine that the will is determined by the inclination, or disposition or character; and this is made up of the aggregate of thoughts, of feelings and tendencies, back of the will. Freedom of the will is supposed to lie in the power to act. according to the inclination or disposition, while there is no power to act against that inclination or disposition. This doctrine obliterates freedom. The man must act according to his character-something back of the will; (exactly the theory of Dr. Hodge) then he; must have character before he can act. Thus his character determines his action, and not his action his character. Those who hold the view that the inclination determines the action, admit that the will is not free if it is determined by anything outside of the man himself. But if the inclination determines the will, and this inclination is determined by nature or surroundings, then the will is determined by something outside of the man himself, and is not free; and the entire character and action are effects for which the agent is not responsible. Every such linking of the will to motive, inclination, character, making its action determined by something out of itself, makes the man a machine and annihilates responsibility. The true conception is that man, with his free will, the power to determine his own moral action and character, stands in the presence of the motives which solicit him to choose, and freely makes his choice, or determines his governing purpose. Unless this power exists in men, of determining their action in the midst of whatever motives, there is no free agency, no obligation, no virtue, no sin. It is utter delusion to say there is freedom, if there is power to choose according to the inclination, without power to go against the inclination. There is just as much freedom in the falling of an apple, or in water flowing down hill, or according to the inclination; it flows freely. This is the conception which some have who claim that they maintain the doctrine." Dr. Hodge thinks it is the highest freedom.

4. Dr. Hodge makes a great argument for his "certainty." He argues: (1) From God's foreknowledge. "Human acts are known before they occur in time, and consequently are foreknown. But if foreknown as future they must be certain. It is a contradiction in terms to say that an uncertain event can be foreknown as certain. If all things are known by Him, all things, whether fortuitous or free, are certain; consequently certainty must be consistent with freedom" (p. 299). He calls it only certainty; but it is very plain that necessity is in his thought. For on page 300 he says: "If from all eternity it is fixed how every man will act; if the same consequences follow invariably from the same antecedents; if the acts of men are inevitable, this is declared to be fatalism!" Here the cat is out of the bag at last. Its name is "Fixed FROM ALL ETERNITY," "CONDUCT OF MEN INEVITABLE." But he Complains that it is very, very unkind in us to call it "FATALISM'." Oh, perish the thought. It is only certainty!

(2) He argues his certainty from foreordination. He says, page 301, "Those who believe that God foreordains whatever comes to pass, must believe that the occurrence of all events is WITH UNALTERABLE CERTAINTY! There is no difficulty attending the doctrine of foreordination which does not attach to that of foreknowledge. The latter supposes the certainty of free acts, and

the former SECURES THEIR CERTAINTY. If their being certain be consistent with liberty, their being RENDERED CERTAIN cannot be incompatible with it. All that foreordination does is to RENDER IT CERTAIN that free acts shall occur. The foreordination of future events precludes the doctrine of contingency." Of course there would be no "necessity" about an act of man "DETERMINED WITH UNALTERABLE CERTAINTY" by an omnipotent God! We think John Calvin showed more candor when he wrote the following: "For since God foresees future events only in consequence of his decree that they shall happen, it is useless to contend about foreknowledge, while it is evident that all things come to pass by ordination and decree. It is a horrible decree I confess; but no one can deny that God foreknew the future fate of man before he created; and that he did foreknow it because it was appointed by his own decree." The fair-minded student can judge for himself whether there is any "necessity" in such a doctrine.

(3) Hodge argues certainty from God's providence (p. 301): "That doctrine teaches that God governs all creatures and all their actions. Here again the difficulty is the same, and is no greater than before. Foreknowledge supposes certainty; foreordination DETERMINES it; and providence EFFECTS it!" If this is not a concatenated scheme of necessity and fatalism, then what is it? And what could be?

Then the Doctor grows eloquent. "Who for any metaphysical difficulty,- who, because he is not able to comprehend how God can effectually govern free agents without destroying their nature, would give up the doctrine of providence? Who would wish to see the reins of universal empire fall from the hands of infinite wisdom and love, to be seized by chance or fate? Who would not rather be governed by a Father than by a tornado? If God cannot EFFECTUALLY CONTROL THE ACTS OF FREE AGENTS there Can be no prophecy, no prayer, no thanksgiving, no promise, no security of salvation, no certainty whether in the end God or Satan is to be triumphant, whether heaven or hell is to be the consummation. Give us certainty-the secure conviction that a sparrow cannot fall, or a sinner move a finger, but as God permits and ordains."

It sounds very fine and eloquent; but let us illuminate it with an illustration. A few months ago a young married man in Virginia hid a loaded shot-gun in the bushes skirting a lonely road. Then he, Mr. Beatty, took his young, unsuspecting wife, the mother of his babe, in his automobile to that spot and "moved his finger" on the trigger and shot her in the back of the head, and brought her dead body back to town,-all that he might bask in the sunshine of his mistress' smiles. Now, according to Dr. Hodge, that "moving of that wicked man's finger" on the trigger of that gun pointed at his faithful wife, was "permitted," "ordained," "effected by God's providence," "determined with unalterable certainty," "and "fixed from all eternity," by his foreordination! Then this great man deludes himself and tries to delude others into believing that this is not "necessity"! Oh, no, no! it is only "certainty." If so, then language has no meaning.

Let us hear Fairchild on this kind of certainty: "It is said that God's foreknowledge implies that events are certain, otherwise they could not be foreknown. This is true, but what do we mean by the certainty of events? It is often meant that they are so linked to existing causes that they must occur as they will occur. This is more than certainty-it is necessity. There are those who discard the word necessity as implying fatalism, and substitute "certainty,"- but they still carry the idea of necessity in their thought.

Certainty is properly simple futurity. The event is in the future, and will take place, and God foresees it in the future. His foreknowledge does not cause it or make it certain. Its certainty or futurity is the condition of His foreknowledge, its logical antecedent. He could not foreknow it if it were not to be. Whatever causes the event to come to pass makes it certain. In the world of nature, the divine will, working through natural forces, makes natural events certain. The choice of a free agent who shall exist a thousand years hence, is just as certain as any event of nature, and thus is an object of God's foreknowledge; but the cause of that certainty is the agent himself that is to be." How much more sane and sensible this is than Dr. Hodge's monstrosity of Calvinism! But we will hear him through.

(4) He argues his doctrine from the regeneration of men. He! says: "The whole Christian world believes that God can convert men. They believe that He can effectually, lead them to repentance and faith; and that He can secure them in heaven from ever falling into sin. That is, they believe that He can render their free acts absolutely certain. He can by His grace, without violating I their freedom, make it absolutely certain that they will repent, and I believe, and persevere in holiness" (p. 302.) Could an equal number of words contain a more infamous reflection on our holy and loving God? It implies that God could save everybody if He would, and He does not do it because He prefers that the great mass of mankind should be damned. But this atrocious argument is in perfect harmony with that lovely Calvinistic creed which runs as follows: "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestined unto everlasting life and others foreordained to everlasting death. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished." The simple answer is that man, being endowed with a free-will, is arbiter of his own destiny. God will not and cannot convert him against his will. Salvation and compulsion are contradictory terms. There must be human co-operation.

(5) Dr. Hodge makes another argument for his "certainty" from the moral character of volitions. Thus: "Unless the will be determined by the previous state of mind, in opposition to being self-determined, there can be no morality in our acts. A man is responsible for his external acts, because they are decided by his will; he is responsible for his volitions, because they are determined by his principles and feelings; he is responsible for his principles and feelings; because of their inherent nature as good or bad, and because they are his own, and constitute his character. If a man when filled with pious feelings can will the most impious acts; or, when filled with enmity to God, have the volitions of a saint, then his volitions and acts have nothing to do with the man himself."

It will be remembered, this was answered under the third argument, by a quotation from President Fairchild. We will add, that the argument implies that a man's choice must always be as his previous feelings, disposition and character. We all know it is not true. Men are continually choosing, against their previous character, and so are continually changing their character. Good men, become bad men, and bad men become good men. The angels were holy in heaven, perhaps for a million years. At last a third part of them somehow, in spite of their holiness, managed to make a sinful choice. So did our first parents. And we see sinners making right choices, and reforming their lives; and see Christians making wrong choices and back-sliding. The every day facts are against his argument.

(6) He argues "certainty" from the doctrine of a sufficient cause (p. 306). He says: "The axiom that every effect must have a cause, or the doctrine of a sufficient reason, applies to the internal as well as to the external world. It governs the whole sphere of our experience, inward and outward. There must have been some sufficient reason why it was so, rather than otherwise. That reason was not the mere power of the agent to act; for that only accounts for his acting, not for his acting one way rather than another."

This is nothing but the old doctrine of necessity, from the law of cause and effect. Stewart answers: "The advocates for liberty acknowledge that the motive is the occasion for acting, or the reason for acting; but contend that it is so far from being the efficient cause of it, that it supposes the efficiency to reside elsewhere, namely, in the mind of the agent."

Dr. Hodge further argues that "a man may be justly accountable for acts which are determined by his character, whether that character or inward state be inherited, concreated, innate, acquired or infused" (pp. 308, 309).

Here his discussion ends. And what a doctrine! A man's conduct is all "determined," "fixed from all eternity," by his "internal state," which was also "foreknown, predetermined and fixed." His internal state is innate, concreated by God and inherited, and is the penalty of Adam's sin. And from the determination of Adam's sin, a man "must be a sinner" and, no matter though he is in such a sad plight, through no fault of his own, he must be damned for it, unless purely arbitrary and irresistible grace brings him to salvation! Where does either accountability or responsibility have any place in such a scheme?

The occurrence of all events is "determined with unalterable certainty." Foreknowledge foreknew them as certain. Therefore foreordination determines them. Providence "effects" them, for "providence SECURES the certainty." Now, all the sins of the universe are among the events that occur. God foreknew them as certain, for, according to Hodge and Calvin, His foreordination "determined" them; and his providence "effected them," ie., "SECURED THEIR CERTAINTY." Yet sinners, with utter "inability" to do right, must be eternally damned for necessary conduct, which God "foreknew," because he "foreordained," "fixed it from all eternity," "determined it with unalterable certainty," and, "by his providence, effected and made it securely certain"! Out on such a blasphemous reflection on God, such a moral monstrosity, such a nightmare of human reason!

We have dwelt at length on these theories of Edwards and Hodge; for they are giant Calvinists, and show that system of thought completely. They give us the best that Calvinism has to offer on Freedom of the Will, or Free Moral Agency. They professed to be arguing for it, and probably thought they were. But they ran themselves and their followers into the black ditch of fatalism. And it is the best that Calvinism has to offer a sin-stricken world.

Jonathan Edwards argued his own son into skepticism. Dr. Hodge advocated stern views from which the minds of men instinctively revolt first to liberalism, then to infidelity. Such doctrines lead to clouds and darkness, unbelief and despair. In that direction the truth will not be found.

* * * * *

CHAPTER IV -- THE TRUE THEORY OF MORAL FREEDOM

We have already discussed: I. The Necessitarian Schemes. II. The Teaching of Edwards. III. The Teaching of Dr. Hodge. We have found them all akin, conducting the mind to the same logical conclusion-NECESSITY. IV. We now propose to present the true and only rational theory of moral agency, or moral freedom.

1. What is a motive to an action of will? Motive is anything which may operate as a reason for action or as an influence to it. "In regard to the operation of motive," says President Fairchild, "there is great danger of misconception. There is a strong tendency to transfer the mechanical idea of force and motion to the facts of moral action. Motive does not move the will. The agent himself, the moral person, assumes his attitude of will in view of the motive, which he makes the occasion, or reason of his action.

Motives are necessary to moral action, because there must be something to arouse the mind, something to be done, something for the choice to terminate upon, in all moral action; and out of this object the motive arises. There could be no obligation without motive; obligation implies something to be chosen or regarded for its own sake.

Again, let us remember that the motive is the reason for the action-that in view of which the agent, in the exercise of his will, decides or determines. The motive does not determine the action, in the sense of being the cause of it. It excites the moral agent to a choice; but the moral agent is the cause of his own action; and with the same motives acting upon him objectively, he has full power and freedom to put forth one action or another. The motive furnishes the occasion for the action" but the agent is the cause of it. "Motives address us through two channels, and thus there are two classes of objective motives appealing to us; and therefore there are two classes of subjective motives, that is of reasons accepted by men for their action. These two channels are the understanding, or the intelligence, and the feelings. A course of action may commend itself to our intelligence as useful, right and proper, and therefore obligatory; or to our feelings, as agreeable or disagreeable, desirable or undesirable.

Thus in moral action two courses are always open to us, and only two. All motives reduce to these two~ classes, and all character is formed under one or the other of these two forces, reason and impulse; and these two classes of motives are, probably, always present objectively, to every moral agent, and one of them is accepted subjectively" (Fairchild's Theology, pp. 40-42).

"A demand is sometimes made for a sufficient reason why the agent acts as he does; why one man is sinful, another virtuous. There is no ground for demanding a reasonable reason-one which justifies the action. There can be no such reason for a wrong action, but there is always a sufficient motive for the action. The sinner does what he likes to do instead of what he ought to do. Every one knows the operation of this motive in his own consciousness. The motive for wrongdoing is perfectly apparent-the only reason for the action, (gratification of the sensibility). Nor do we need to look for the cause of any moral action. To look for such cause out of the man himself, in the exercise of his own will, is to make the man a machine, and to set aside personal responsibility" (p. 42).

Now we are prepared to consider the question whether the will is always, as Edwards says, "as the strongest motive," or "as the greatest apparent good." President Fairchild gives this admirable and lucid answer: "There are two possible affirmative answers to this question, (both of them wrong). (1) The will must be as the strongest motive by necessity; it cannot act against the strongest motive; this is pure necessitarianism, and leaves no room for freedom. (2) The will is always as the strongest motive, but not as a matter of necessity, simply as a fact. The true answer to the questions is, No, NEITHER AS A NECESSITY NOR AS A FACT.

How do we measure the strength of motive? There are two ways-by the judgment or reason, and by the sensibility or feeling. The two standards are entirely different, but the will is not always as the strongest motive, tested by either standard. It is not always as the best judgment; for the sinner always acts against the true reason as presented by his judgment. Nor is it always as the strongest feeling; the good man often obeys his judgment against his feeling.

If the strongest motive be defined as the motive that prevails, then the answer to the question is determined by definition. But in this case the will determines for itself what motive shall be the strongest by yielding to the one or the other. The will then determines the motive, and not the motive the will" (pp. 43, 44). In other words, the free moral agent, himself gives the strength to the motive.

2. Let us consider the nature of choice. It is commonly supposed by many writers that only three elements enter into a choice. The conditions of choice are (1) an end. (2) A motive state. (3) An impulsive decision. Were this all, and choice was an immediate effect of motive, impulse, then necessity would often at least, be the result. But if it is an act of personal agency, through reflection and judgment, then we are free. And this is the simple truth. There is (4), a power of suspending choice, to give time for reflection and judgment. This follows the motive state, and delays decision, so that the decision does not immediately follow the motive state. The connection is broken, and the moral agent in his action is perfectly free.

This is what distinguishes the conduct of a true man from that of an animal. The first three facts named above, viz., an end, a motive state, and a decision, might all be affirmed of an animal. But what distinguishes the choice of a moral personality is that it may be and always ought to be, the result of a rational use of the intelligence. Without such reflection our conduct is very like that of the brutes. Miley well says: "If the elective volition is in immediate sequence to the motive impulse, it must be a necessary effect of that impulse. There can be no intervention of our personal agency, whereby the result can be prevented or modified. (There would be no time for it). A motive can only act in one of two modes: either as a solicitation or inducement to the mind, as a personal agent, the end of which he may either accept or refuse, or as a causal efficiency immediately determining the mind to the end. In the latter case there can be no personal agency in the resulting volition. The causal force of the motive determines the action of the mind, just as the weight determines the action of the balance. Hence THE MOTIVE MUST BE AN INSTANT CAUSE TO A COMPLETE EFFECT OR IT NEVER CAN CAUSE THE CHOICE" (Vol. II, p. 285).

The mental facts of choice then are the following:

a. The conception of an end. Choosing is choosing something. Whatever it is, it must be mentally apprehended in order to be chosen. Mere instinct may lead to its end without mental forethought, as when birds build their nests or bees their cells, or beavers their dam, but rational mind cannot act in this way. It must consider the end to be chosen, and is a fundamental element of choice.

b. The mind must be in a motive state with regard to this end. There must be some kind of interest in it, arising from appetite or desire or reason or moral nature, which moves to action or choice.

c. In personal agency there always may be, and always ought to be, an action of the judgment respecting the ELIGIBILITY OF THE END. "Such reflection and judgment are necessary to a proper personal agency in choice."

d. When the judgment has made its estimate of the value of the end to be chosen, the choice is made in the light of self-pleasing, or prudence, or duty. Thus in free moral agency there is the power of rational self-action. In the exercise of this power, ends are considered, motives are weighed, results are reflected upon, and the choice is made in perfect freedom, with the consciousness of the power of contrary choice.

3. Further observations confirming this doctrine of freedom of choice.

(1) We have seen that choice is a rational election of some end. The rational element lies in the fact that it is for a reason mentally apprehended and approved. And this reason is the true motive of the choice. There must be actual motives and also contrary motives to solicit a choice between them. A mere, appetite or incitement in the sensibilities is not a true rational motive. There must be a good reason for their gratification outside of themselves. Hunger and thirst prompt us to eat and drink; but their mere gratification is not the true reason for action. We eat and drink to live; otherwise we might eat and drink to excess and to our death just for gratification. Beasts do that way, for this is animal life; but it is not the life becoming a free moral agent.

Parental affection, followed simply as a motive impulse, often fails of duty, leading to the unwise indulgence and lack of government of the children, which ends in their ruin. The proper action can be reached -only by reflection and judgment, which is essential to rational choice. Miley goes so far as to say that "volitions which spring immediately from spontaneous impulses in the sensibilities are not choices, but purely executive volitions, put forth for the attainment of the ends of such impulses." An animal lives that way because he is without the requisite faculties for rational choice of a high end. But man cannot live a noble life by simply following impulses. Our old teacher at Yale, Dr. Samuel Harris, denned sin as "the failure to obey the dictate of right reason." A man who weakly follows the promptings of his sensibilities, without reflective choice, is a sinner, living below the level of possibility and duty. He has the power of rational choice and moral freedom and is not using it. In this, consists his sin. Life is worthy of man only as it proceeds from his personal agency, and this would be a nullity without this power over our motives and volitions which can release us from the absolute domination of our spontaneous impulses. There must therefore be in us a power of suspending choice until we have time to reflect, in order to conduct life virtuously and rationally.

(2) In habits men largely omit this rational suspension of choice, and act immediately from impulse without reflection. In this consists the danger of all evil habits. They were formed without due reflection, perhaps in thoughtless youth; and they are followed in the same way, often leading to eternal ruin unawares.

(3) Let it be remembered, here, that this power of suspension of choice and rational reflection is not self-acting. It is an endowment of free-moral agency which we know we have and which it is our duty to use. The fact that many do live a thoughtless, unreflecting life of impulse and spontaneous desire, does not militate against the truth of free moral agency. People often possess other powers which are allowed to lie dormant. There are people with rare poetical gifts who will live and die "mute, inglorious Miltons." Every one knows there are people with noble musical gifts who never touch an instrument. There are born artists who never paint, and natural orators who never tread the rostrum or sway the masses. It is sufficient for our argument to show that we have the power of free moral agency, or, as it is so often called, free will, whether we always use it or not.

We simply know it is a fact that volition is often deferred for hours or days or even months; men wait to investigate, to obtain more light, to deeply ponder the great concerns of life. All great and noble lives in science and philosophy, in art and literature, in statesmanship and patriotism, in philanthropy and piety, are the result of such rational deliberate choice. That such men are the product of impulse is unthinkable. In truth, reflection must be the daily habit, and the highest practical reason the guide of every such life. Hence the power of rational suspension of choice must belong to moral agency, and every good life is a witness to this great central fact of our being.

(4) What is more, this power of suspension of choice is immediate. We know it by experience, and it must be so, or the volition would immediately follow the impulse and there would be no rational choice. There is, there must be "an intrinsic power of immediate self-movement, a power to pause and reflect when under the impulse of motive, a power whereby the mind may turn itself to such facts or principles as may concern the present inclination, or call them up and hold them under deliberation. For all this there is required no other power or reason than what is ever at the command of a rational agent, so long as his proper agency remains" (Miley). Otherwise a sane and Christian life is impossible and we are the victims of impulse, as helpless as the wheels in a machine-shop, or the stars in their courses. Without this power we would not be rational agents or moral beings.

(5) Oftentimes, the instant application of a principle previously thought out and settled, or a right habit rationally formed, may take the place of suspension of choice. In other cases a clear intuition of duty may suffice, being so instant a vision of the right that no delay for reflection may be necessary. Consciousness bears us witness that this power of suspending choice belongs to the moral agent himself, and is a part of his moral equipment, as a rational being. In other words a rational agent can act rationally.

(6) Objections may be urged against the reality of this power in view of the blindness of moral ignorance, the perversion of error, the enervation of vice, and the thralldom of evil habit. We may admit that rational agency may be greatly enfeebled, or, possibly, entirely overborne, by the force of evil habit and vicious tendency; still the truth remains with regard to undestroyed moral agents.

By a right use of the powers of our personal agency, in the discharge of our moral obligations, we may reach the highest measure of self-command and moral freedom. All have hours for reflection, time to decide on rules of action. It is possible to make it a rule of life always to pause and reflect about every solicitation of doubtful moral bearing, until it shall become a permanent habit of our mind. Thus it will become more and more easy to pause and reflect, and gather strength from the weightiest reasons to resist solicitations to evil.

(7) It is a matter of consciousness that we have power over motives, and motive states. For instance, we know that we can dismiss a present object of thought from mind and replace it with another, or call another subject up for thought and reflection. While it is true that feelings are involuntary, and thought is often spontaneous, or not consciously voluntary, yet we have a voluntary control of our mental faculties. We may dismiss one subject which has interested us, and now becomes a motive, and take up another and bestow upon it profound and exclusive thought. Thus there are two modes of mental activity; the spontaneous, and the self-chosen or self-directed. It is the latter that has produced those great achievements in science, philosophy, art, literature, and statesmanship that have been the glory of the race. Now this power over our faculties to direct attention and thought involves power over motives and motive states to change them, bring them to an end, or to summon others in their stead. We know we have it. It is a matter of experience in every life. People will turn from an interesting conversation, or lay down a most interesting book, or some article in a newspaper which has profoundly moved them, to take up a stale, uninteresting task because it is the thing to be done. This thing may be tested any day, and proved to a demonstration. Thus we are not bound to the satisfaction of any appetite, since we can separate ourselves from the motive object, and can summon a counter influence. We can hold down a fiery impulse by a cool judgment, and take time to reflect, and summon the weighty reasons of piety. We can see, by a little reflection, that if we were without this power over motives and motive-states, our lives would be bound in necessity and we would be as helpless under the power of influences as the tides are helpless to resist the attraction of the moon. But we know that it is not so. The conclusion is inevitable. We can set aside unworthy motives, and cease thinking of unworthy things; we can enthrone the rational and the moral in our lives, over the incitements of appetite and passion, and thus escape the doom of being the passive victim of impulsions to evil.

(8) The question may be asked, is this power used? We promptly answer, Yes, in countless thousands of noble lives. But we are discussing the reality of the powers God has given us, and not the use or the neglect of them. Many use them; and all might use them. Therefore we are all free moral agents truly the author of our character, and justly responsible for our conduct.

(9) It may further be asked whether we have a true capacity for motives which would help us to a pious and holy life. Here we manifestly reach the crucial point, and the profoundest issue of the whole subject. Without hesitation we answer in the affirmative. Voltaire said: "Man is a religious animal." Whatever he may have meant by it, it is certain that man has a capacity for the deepest religious experiences. He can know God and enjoy Him. That means fellowship with God.' And that means that we can share the thoughts and feelings, and aims and purposes that glow in the heart of God. It all means that "there must be in us a capacity for motives of morality and religion, else there can be no actual motive to -the choice of either, and without the proper motive neither can be- chosen. Without the choice neither is possible." The life could not rise into the moral and

religious sphere. We must have this capacity for moral and religious motives, or we are only animals, under no obligation to live a moral and religious life.

Even our inherited depravity does not alter the fundamental facts of our nature. "The moral life of humanity," says Miley, "is double—a life within a life. With all the facts of evil there are the more widely prevalent facts which evince the common sense of moral obligation and responsibility, and the common appreciation of obedience to the duty of morality and religion as the supreme excellence and wisdom of human life. These facts require as their necessary source, a subjective state which constitutes a capacity for the motives of morality and religion, and hence conclude its reality." These are the paramount motives of human life. They are drawn from God and the eternal world, and carry with them the issues of eternal destiny. We can command such motives. It is done by placing the mind in practical relations to great truths of revelation and God and duty and eternity, until we are affected and drawn "by the power of the world to come." Conscience and moral reason are realities in every one still under probation, and, for ought we know, are the eternal possession of every moral being. They only wait for the proper reflection to rise into activity of profound interest in the concerns of the soul. Even the seemingly thoughtless can pause and reflect, while moral duty and the eternal interests which hinge upon it shall rise into view, as of all things supremely important. So the worldly mind can deeply concern itself with heavenly things. And the sensual can be moved by things that are spiritual and pure. Even habits of evil can be broken; for they are not the outgrowth of moral impotence. Nor are they the consequence of the disuse of moral powers but of their abuse, through a long course of willfully chosen sin, from a persistent resistance to the spontaneous protests of conscience and the clear apprehensions of moral reason, and the warnings and pleadings of the Spirit of God. This is a matter of consciousness, known to every soul. We know we can choose good instead of evil, have done it, and always ought to do it. When we do not do it we are the victims of the penalty of self-condemnation.

V. THE PROOFS OF FREE MORAL AGENCY.

1. From the testimony of our own consciousness. Remember that consciousness means that knowledge which every one has of his own sensations or mental states, or of what passes in his own mind. Professor Tappan defines consciousness as "The necessary knowledge which every one has of his own operations, or the power and act of self-recognition. Consciousness implies two things; first, a knowledge of all our mental exercises; and, secondly, a knowledge of ourselves as the subjects of those exercises or mental states. "In consciousness," says Professor Mahan, "we not only know mental phenomena as they are, but we know also the fundamental and distinguishing characteristics of such phenomena" (Intellectual Philosophy, p. 50). When we are angry or pleased, love or hate, remember or fear, choose or refuse, we are immediately sensible of the fact. The knowledge of it is not the result of reasoning; it is not derived from investigation, but rises immediately and spontaneously in the mind. Knowledge derived from consciousness is as certain as our intuitions of primary truths, as surely as we know that an effect must have a cause, or that we ourselves exist. It is even more certain than the knowledge derived from sensation. Sights and sounds may deceive us, but consciousness never does. It needs no arguments, for it carries its own demonstration. We are compelled to yield ourselves up to the insanity of universal skepticism before we can doubt it for a moment.

Here then we find our first argument for the freedom of the will, or free moral agency, or the freedom of man in the use of his will. This conviction of a self-determining power, or a control of the will belonging to us, is as universal as man. A few fatalistic philosophers and necessitarian theologians may raise a dust, and befog themselves and a few others on the subject; but everybody in practical life comes back to the decision of common sense, or the common judgment of mankind, that every man has within himself the power of rational choice, and that in making his decisions, he was beyond the reach of compulsion. President Fairchild affirms that, "the proof of freedom is found only in our consciousness, and can be found nowhere else. We know that we are free and that is the end of the argument; it is a fact of consciousness. Other arguments for freedom are often presented, but they are only different ways of presenting the fact of the consciousness of freedom, or are different indications of the fact. The fact that we hold ourselves bound by duty or obligation to a certain course of action is a good argument for the freedom of the will. But the perception or conviction of the obligation presupposes the consciousness of freedom. The view is sometimes presented that we infer our freedom from our consciousness of obligation. But it is not merely a logical inference. The consciousness of freedom is the logical antecedent of that of obligation, and the thought of freedom must come before, or with, the thought of obligation." We believe he is right, and most of the arguments at least are only varying forms of the argument from consciousness. However we will state some of them as confirmatory of the main argument.

2. All men have a sense of blame when they do wrong. Ralston says: "Am I charged with the commission of a crime? Convince me that the force of circumstances rendered its avoidance absolutely impossible, and I can no more blame myself in the premises than I can censure the tree that fell upon the traveler as he was journeying on the highway." People censure themselves for the commission of crime and for sin of every kind, because they are conscious that under the very same circumstances they might have done otherwise-might have done right. It is the infallible verdict of the soul.

3. Another argument for the self-determining power of man is drawn from universal history. We find in the literature of all ages and all nations common modes of speech, terms and phrases expressive of the universal idea that men are consciously free from necessity in forming their decisions and choices, and shaping their conduct. Men speak or write about the acts of their minds, or the determinations of their wills as though they were free. They express blame, or praise of themselves or others, thus recognizing this principle of freedom as it lies in all minds. They condemn wrong on the express ground that, under the same circumstances and conditions, the wrong-doer might and should have done right.

4. Universal laws bear witness to the freedom of the will, or free agency. By the laws of all civilized nations; criminals are punished upon the universal supposition that they might have avoided the crime. If it could be anywhere proved that a criminal committed his crime from necessity, because of influences or forces, or conditions, that made it impossible for him to do otherwise, there is not a civilized government on earth that would punish that unfortunate victim of necessity. All governments punish criminals, because it is universally recognized that men are free in their acts, and there is no excuse for crime.

All the sanctions of criminal laws are enacted to encourage virtue and deter from vice and crime on the direct supposition that men are free in their conduct, and can respond to encouragements to

right doing. Every police station and jail and prison, every grated window and prison-wall, and scaffold and electric chair and guillotine proclaims the universal conviction of mankind that even the worst of men, under the very circumstances in which they committed their crimes, might have done otherwise.

If this is not true, then all good men should band together in a crusade against all criminal laws and penalties and penal institutions, and arouse a public sentiment of pity and sympathy for all wrong-doers; such men should be pitied and not blamed. But this very notion mocks the common verdict of mankind, proving to a demonstration the universal consciousness of men, that sins and crimes deserve punishment because the sinner and criminal are free and might have done otherwise.

5. The action of a sinner's mind in repentance proves his freedom. Does he lament necessary conduct? Does he come before his fellowmen and his God, and make a humiliating confession that, "with the same character and environments and impulses and motives" which he had, his conduct was "inevitable" and his behavior unavoidable? Does he dare to approach his Maker and tell Him, that his evil behavior "was fixed from all eternity"? We know he does nothing of the kind. In a case of genuine repentance there is no trifling, no philosophical excusing of sin, or calling it a "necessity." On the other hand, there is a deep humiliation and contrition and self-abasement, and confession of guilty commission of avoidable sin. An honest sinner throws all Calvinistic philosophy to the winds when he repents.

6. The convicting work of the Holy Spirit bears witness to our moral freedom. The conduct of the Holy Spirit may be depended upon to be in harmony with truth. He is "the Spirit of truth." Does he tell the sinner that in all his excesses, and vile deeds, and wicked choices, he was a poor unfortunate, a sad victim of irresistible motives, that his base deeds were all "determined with unalterable certainty" and "effected by the providence of God"? Every man on earth that has ever been convicted for sin knows better.

The Spirit arraigned him as guilty and deserving of the frowns and condign punishment of a holy God, because all the time he was pursuing his wicked sins, he might have been obeying his Maker and blessing the world.

7. The Scriptures everywhere address man as a being capable of choosing aright; as possessing a control over his own volitions and as being held responsible for the proper exercise of that control. Moses said: "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live" (Deut. 30: 19). "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve" (Josh. 24: 15). Now to choose is to determine the action of the will; and these men were called upon to do it for themselves. But if their wills were fixed by antecedent causes, or motives beyond their control, such words are but a solemn mockery of human helplessness. Jesus said of the Jews: "How often would I have gathered thy children together even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, but ye would not (Matt. 23:37). "Ye will not come to me that ye might have life" (John 5:40). And Jesus denounced woes upon them for their obduracy and unwillingness. Now would the holy Jesus have thus upbraided them, if their conduct had been "fixed," and their choices "necessary"? It is akin to blasphemy to affirm it.

8. The very idea of Freedom is properly advanced as an argument for the fact of freedom. This idea, it is said, must be explained. "Now do we obtain it? There is nothing out of ourselves to suggest it? Everything in the heavens above, and 'in the earth beneath, and in the waters under the earth,' is bound in the chain of cause and effect, and cannot suggest the idea of freedom, nor even of necessity. The idea of necessity is the correlative of that of Freedom; neither can come without the other. The idea or conception of Freedom comes from the consciousness of freedom within ourselves, and the idea of necessity in the same way." These arguments are all good and prove the case to a demonstration. But we will adduce one more.

9. The rewards and penalties of the next world demand freedom in this. If all human conduct is "necessary" and "fixed," and "determined with unalterable certainty," then each creature does what he cannot help doing, and all alike are carrying out divine foreordination. Why should one party be praised and another blamed? On such a theory there can be no character in conduct, and consequently no blame and no desert of punishment. All men would be like so many stones helplessly in the hands of the architect. One stone is put in the foundation down in the mud and the other is polished and placed in the tower. If men are used in that way, by the supreme architect of the universe, why praise or blame anybody for anything? Men cannot help reasoning in this way. Logical minds can not help coming to the conclusion that if we are punished in the next world we must be free in this, or we cannot, by any possibility deserve punishment.

10. It is objected to this doctrine that it is inconsistent with God's foreknowledge. These writers think that God foreknows future events only because he knows all present causes; and all future events are linked to these, in the chain of cause and effect. Hence the cause of an act of a free-being, who shall live a thousand years hence, is now in existence, and thus God is enabled to foreknow that act. No assumption of Calvinists is more gross than this, that God cannot foreknow unless he foreordains, or knows the result of an endless chain of causes and effects. Fairchild answers thus: "This links all events, finally, in the chain of cause and effect, and does away with freedom. But the proposed explanation of God's foreknowledge is a groundless assumption. It is limiting the divine nature to human conditions, making God's foreknowledge mere FINITE PRESCIENCE. God may know the future directly, immediately, the method is mysterious to us" (Fairchild's Theology, p. 46).

But Dr. Ralston points out one more inference from this argument as surprising as it is logical. "This objection," he says, "labors under the serious difficulty that while it aims to destroy the free-agency of man, it really would destroy the free-agency of God. For if what is foreknown as certain must also be necessary, and cannot possibly be otherwise, then, as God foreknew from eternity every act that He would ever perform, He has, all the while, instead of being a free-agent, acting after "the counsel of his own will," been nothing more than a passive machine, acting as acted upon by stern necessity. This conclusion is most horribly revolting; but, according to the argument of necessitarians it cannot possibly be avoided." God like man would be a victim of necessity, and stern, relentless fate is on the throne of the universe. The monstrosity of the result shows the worthlessness of the argument. It is perfectly manifest that God's foreknowledge of His own acts does not destroy His free-agency; no more does His foreknowledge of the future acts of men make them necessary, and destroy man's free-agency.

VI. Some irresistible inferences to be drawn from the foregoing truths.

1. It is contrary to consciousness and Scripture and reason, to hold to the thought of MORAL INABILITY. It is one of the great five points of Calvinism. But it is an error like all the rest -of them. Many Methodist writers use the term, -but always unwisely. It is wholly inconsistent with their system of theology, which is the best in the world. We have seen that man has freedom of will, or is a free-moral agent. That means, of course, to do his duty, to obey God. The willing aright, or choosing aright is obeying. "If there be first a willing mind it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not." "In this passage, we are plainly taught that if one wills as God directs he has thereby met his obligation; that he has done all that is naturally possible to him, and nothing more is required. The Bible in this text expressly limits obligation by ability" (Finney's Theology, p. 339). "But is it not true, as is affirmed, that men instinctively and necessarily affirm their obligation to be able to obey God, while they at the same time affirm, that they are not able? We answer, no. They affirm themselves to be under obligation simply, and only, because deeply in their inward being lies the assumption that they are able to comply with the requirements of God. They are conscious of ability to will, and of power to control their outward life directly, and the states of the intellect and of their sensibility, either directly or indirectly, by willing. Upon this consciousness they found the affirmation of obligation. But for the consciousness of ability, no affirmation of moral obligation, or of praise-worthiness or blame-worthiness, were possible.

"It is true indeed that God requires of men, especially under the Gospel, what they are unable to do directly in their own strength. Or more strictly speaking, He requires them to lay hold on His strength, or to avail themselves of His grace, as the condition of being what He requires them to be. Through grace we are able to be more than conquerors and we are able to avail ourselves of God's grace, so that there is no proper inability in the case" (p. 340). "There is no inability but a wicked disinclination to obey God." Man possesses the natural ability to obey all the requirements of God. The law of God ever requires obedience, so that must be possible. That which requires absolute impossibilities, is not and cannot be moral law. Moral law is the law of nature, and what law of nature would that be that should require impossibilities? This would be a mockery of a law of nature. What! a law of nature requiring that which is impossible to nature, both directly and indirectly! Impossible!" (p. 363).

It is argued that "Adam's first sin plunged himself and his posterity, descending from him, into a total inability of nature to render any obedience to God." We admit the sad effects of the fall upon our entire nature; but we deny the inference of moral inability to will so as to please God. The body was injured by the fall; but we have a body left, sufficient for the demands of duty. The mind was injured; but we have a mind left. The memory was injured; but we have a memory left, to which God often appeals. Our conscience was injured; but we still have a conscience left to which God often appeals. Our sensibilities were deranged by the fall; but we still have a sensibility left to which God may appeal and does appeal. Our moral reason was injured and our intuitions; but we still have a moral reason sufficient to respond to the appeals of God. By a parity of reasoning, our will was injured and weakened; but we still have a will-power left, injured though it is, sufficient to respond to God's appeals. And God always appeals to it, and demands an obedient response. The truth is, the whole theory of moral inability is a theological fiction, contrary to

consciousness, conscience, moral reason, the voice of Scripture, and all the appeals of a just and holy God.

2. Let us now consider the term GRACIOUS ABILITY. We find it often used in Methodist writings; but we doubt the wisdom of using it. The logical inferences that must go with it are not in harmony With Methodist theology. We magnify ability, and rejoice in grace; but "gracious ability" means too much. Let us review: a moral being-a person, as we have seen must be possessed of three attributes, -intellect, sensibility, and free will. These are the essential attributes of moral being.

Ability means nothing more than the possession of these essential faculties which enable us to make the moral choices and perform the duties of a moral being. Ability to obey God is simply the possession of a power, adequate to make the choices which God requires. Now a being without either intellect, or sensibility, or free-will, would not be a moral being, and could not be a creature of moral obligation, any more than a horse or a stick of wood.

Grace is unmerited favor. Its exercise consists in bestowing that which, without a violation of justice, might be withheld. Now those who use this phrase seem to mean this: "By the first sin of Adam, he and all his posterity, lost all natural power and all ability of every kind to obey God; that therefore as a race, man would have been wholly unable to obey the moral law, or to render God any; acceptable service whatever. That is, the race, as a consequence of Adam's sin, would have been wholly unable to use the powers of nature in any other way than to sin. They would have been able to sin or disobey God but entirely unable to obey Him. They would have had power to act only in one direction-in the way of opposition to the will of God.

By gracious ability seems to be meant that, by virtue of the universal atonement, the help of the Holy Spirit is given to every human being, and, while grace lasts, they are endowed with a gracious ability to obey God."

Now we will let Finney, with his inexorable logic, point out what would logically follow, though we greatly abbreviate his argument.

1. Finney says: If this doctrine of natural inability and gracious ability be true, it inevitably follows that but for the atonement of Christ and the bestowment of gracious ability, no one of Adam's race could ever have been capable of sinning. For in this, case the whole race would have been wholly destitute of any kind or degree of ability to obey God. Consequently they could not have] been subjects of moral government, and of course their actions could; have had no moral character. It is a first truth of reason, a truth by all men and everywhere necessarily assumed in their practical judgments, that a subject of moral government must be a moral agent, or that moral agency is a necessary condition of anyone's being a subject of moral government. Moral character cannot otherwise justly be predicated of his moral actions, any more than of a horse, or of a lunatic, or of an idiot.

2. It must follow that both Adam and his posterity would and could have sustained to God only the relation of necessary, as opposed to free agents, had not God bestowed upon them gracious ability. But that either Adam or his posterity lost their freedom or free-agency by the first sin of Adam, is

not only a SHEER BUT AN ABSURD ASSUMPTION. To be sure Adam fell into a total alienation from God, and his posterity followed his example. He and they have become dead in trespasses and sins. Now (but) that this death in sin consists in, or implies the loss of free agency, is the very thing to be proved. But this cannot be proved.

3. It follows that, when the Holy Spirit is withdrawn from man, he is no longer a free moral agent, and from that moment he is incapable of moral action, and of course can sin no more. Hence, should he live any number of years after the Spirit's withdrawal, neither sin nor holiness, virtue nor vice, praiseworthiness nor blameworthiness could be predicated of his conduct. The same will and must be true of all his future eternity.

4. If the doctrine in question be true, it follows that from the moment of the withdrawal of the Gracious Ability or Holy Spirit, man is no longer a subject of moral obligation. It is from that moment absurd and unjust to require any duty of him. Nay to conceive of him as being any longer a subject of duty; to think or speak of duty belonging to him, is as absurd as to think or speak of the duty of a mere machine. From the moment of the withholding of a gracious ability, he ceased to be a free and became a necessary agent, having power to act in but one direction. Such a being can by no possibility be capable of sin or holiness. Suppose he still possesses power to act, contrary to the letter of the law of God. What then? This action can have no moral character, because, act in some way he must, and he can act in no other way. It is nonsense to affirm that such action can be sinful in the sense of blameworthy. To affirm that it can is to contradict a first truth of reason. Sinners, then, who have quenched the Holy Spirit, and from whom he is wholly withdrawn, are no longer to be blamed for their enmity against God, and for all their opposition to him. They are, according to this doctrine, as free from blame as are the motions of a mere machine.

5. If the doctrine in question be true, there is no reason to believe that the angels who fell from their allegiance to God ever sinned but once. If Adam lost his free-agency by the fall, the angels did so too. If a gracious ability had not been bestowed upon Adam, it is certain, according to this doctrine in question, that he never could have been the subject of moral obligation from the moment of his first sin, and consequently could never again have sinned. The same must be true of devils. If by their first sin they fell into the condition of necessary agents, having lost their free agency, they have never sinned since, and they are not now to blame for all they do to oppose God and to ruin souls. According to the supposition they cannot help it and you might as well blame the winds and waves for what they do as to blame Satan for what he does.

6. There is not and never will be any sin in hell, for the plain reason that there are no moral agents there. They are necessary agents, unless it be true, that the Holy Spirit and a gracious ability be continued there. If they deny to the inhabitants of hell freedom of the will, or, which is the same thing, natural ability to obey God, they must admit or be grossly inconsistent, that there is no sin in hell, either in men or devils.

7. But that a gracious ability to do duty or to obey God is an absurdity will further appear, if we consider that it is a first truth of reason, that moral obligation implies moral agency, and that moral agency implies freedom of will or, in other words, it implies a natural ability to comply with obligation. This ability is necessarily regarded by the intelligence as the sine qua non of moral obligation, on the ground of natural and immutable justice. A just command always implies an

ability to obey it. A command to perform a natural impossibility would not, and could not, impose obligation. Suppose God should command human beings to fly without giving them power; could such a command impose moral obligation? No, indeed! But if he did give them power relative to the command, the bestowment would not be grace but justice (Finney's Theology, pp. 341-348).

"But it may be asked, Is there no grace in all that is done by the Holy Spirit to make man wise unto salvation? Yes, indeed, I answer, And it is grace and great grace, just because the doctrine of a natural inability in man to obey God is not true. It is just because man is well able to render obedience, and unjustly refuses to do so, that all the influence that God brings to bear upon him to move him to obedience, is a gift and an influence of grace. The grace is great, just in proportion to the sinner's ability to comply with God's requirements, and the strength of his voluntary opposition to his duty. If man were properly unable to obey, there could be no grace in giving him ability to obey, when the bestowment of ability is considered relatively to the command. But let man be regarded as free, as possessing natural ability to obey all the requirements of God, and all his difficulty as consisting in a wicked heart, or, which is the same thing in an unwillingness to obey, then an influence on the part of God designed and tending to make him willing is grace indeed. But strip man of his freedom, render him naturally unable to obey, and you render grace impossible, so far as his obligation to obedience is concerned" (p. 349). "The difficulty to be overcome is everywhere in the Bible represented to be the sinner's unwillingness alone. It cannot possibly be anything else; for the willingness is the doing required by God." The strong language often found in Scripture upon the subject of man's inability to obey God, is designed only to represent the strength of his voluntary selfishness, and enmity against God, and never to imply a proper natural inability" (p. 350).

"I reject the dogma of a gracious ability because it involves a denial of the true grace of the Gospel. I maintain that the Gospel, with all its influences, including the gift of the Holy Spirit, to convict, convert and sanctify the soul, is a system of grace throughout. But to maintain this, I must also maintain that God might justly have required obedience of men, without making these provisions for them. And to maintain the justice of God in requiring obedience, I must admit and maintain that obedience was possible to man" (p. 352).

We think Finney's reasoning on this point is unanswerable. It would be far truer to the teaching of Scripture, and consciousness and reason, to say that WE HAVE AN IMPAIRED NATURAL ABILITY PLUS GRACE, than to say that we have lost all natural ability to obey God and have only a TEMPORARY GRACIOUS ABILITY instead. The inevitable logical inferences are too grave and startling, to accept the doctrine that lies back of this unfortunate term, inconsistent with the true doctrines of Methodism.

Dr. Miley closes his great discussion as follows: "This is the doctrine of a rational and real freedom. It rests upon no false ground, and is constructed with no irrelevant or irreconcilable principles. Every vitally related fact of psychology and personal agency has its proper place and office. The theory of a valid and responsible freedom under a law of MORAL INABILITY is OF ALL THEORIES THE MOST IRRATIONAL. It requires that the good be chosen, not only without actual motive, but also against the dominance of inevitable counter motive. By so much does it sink below the liberty of indifference or the freedom of mere arbitrary volition. The doctrine here maintained is clear of all these errors. Personal agency is the ground of truth. This agency must be

a reality, else there can be no place for the question of freedom. If a reality it must have all requisite faculties. Then freedom should no longer be a question in issue. Its denial involves a denial of personal agency in man. Personal agency and free-agency are the same. For required choices sufficient motives are within our command. This is rational freedom. It is not the freedom of moral impotence, impotence in the very seat of the necessary potency. It is the freedom of personal agency, with power for required choices. It is sufficient for the sphere of our responsible life. Spontaneous impulses often tend toward the irrational and the evil. But we can summon into thought and reflection and into the apprehension of conscience and the moral reason, all the countermotives of obligation and spiritual well-being as they may arise in the view of God and redemption and the eternal destinies. With these resources of paramount motive, and the light and blessing of the Holy Spirit, ever gracious and helpful, we may freely choose the good against the evil. This is the reality of Freedom in Christ" (Vol. II, pp. 306, 307).

The most compact statement of the doctrine of free-agency we have seen is by Dr. Daniel Steele in Binney's Compend (pp. 111-113). There is no dominance of motives, no Calvinistic necessity, no moral inability, no gracious ability in it. Every sentence is a nugget of pure gold. It ought to be written on the fly-leaf of every minister's Bible, in the interest of truth and clearness of thought. It is as follows: "Though man is fallen and sadly depraved, so that there is in his nature a strong tendency toward sin, yet does he retain the Godlike attribute of freedom. In every volition of a moral nature, he is free to will the opposite. No decree of God, no chain of causation behind his will, no combination of elements in his constitution, compel his moral acts. The gracious aid of the Holy Spirit, is only suasive not necessitating. Acts 7:51, Eph. 4: 30; 1 Thess. 5: 19. The free will is a self-determining, original cause, itself uncaused in its volitions. It is a new and responsible fountain of causation in the universe. Proof 1: Consciousness: "I know I am free and that is the end of it."-Dr. Samuel Johnson.

2. Such freedom is involved in the feeling of moral obligation, and in the sense of guilt for our misdeeds.

"If man be punished in the future state God must be the pun-isher.

"If God be the punisher the punishment must be just.

"If the punishment be just, the punished might have done otherwise.

"If the punished might have done otherwise they were free agents.

"Therefore, if men are to be punished in the future world, they must be free in this."

3. The Scriptures everywhere assume that men are free to obey God's law, and to comply with the conditions of salvation. Prov. 1: 23-31; Matt. 23: 37; John 7: 17.

4. If men's acts are the effects of causes arranged by God, then either God is the author of sin, or, His own acts being the effects of some necessitating cause, such as the strongest motive, or the constitution of His nature, the universe is under the iron law of Fate, and sin is an illusion and an impossibility."

To which we say, Amen, and Amen.

* * * * *

CHAPTER V -- PRIMITIVE HOLINESS AND PROBATION

We have seen, in our previous discussions, what are the essential elements or attributes of a moral being, viz., intellect, sensibility and free will. We must have these to be moral persons, accountable beings, creatures of moral obligation and accountability. In the possession of these faculties consists our likeness to God, as His children.

But we are not holy, save as we have been made so by a special work of grace. This is the moral consciousness of the race. And our present was not our original condition. We were created in the moral image and likeness of God. God looked upon man as He came fresh from His creating hand and pronounced him "very good"-superlative praise for superlative wisdom to bestow. There was nothing abnormal in his moral nature then-no moral derangement, as there is now.

I. What then was the nature of Adamic holiness? We are now discussing the primitive quality of it, prior to any moral action. It must have been void of any ethical element; for that comes by conduct and voluntary choice. It is the result of the exercise of the personal faculties-intellect, sensibility and free will. The question is, what was the state of Adam's nature before he had made any character by the use of his faculties? Wherein did it differ from the nature of man as he is now born? In a true Godly life, such as Paul lived, there is personal holiness, the holiness of character, with the ethical qualities of righteous action. This is, in a way, quite different from a primitive holiness, divinely created and all unused. Adam's holiness, must have consisted simply in a natural disposition in perfect harmony with moral duty. It was, in other words, a subjective state in harmony with his moral relations. It took time for Adam to know all his duties, and to choose the right; but he came into being with a subjective moral tendency to the good. It was "a created moral excellence, perfect in its kind but wholly un-meritorious." And so Adam's nature was holy, that is, correct; but a holy character had yet to be made, by a right use of his will. There was no merit due to Adam for it, he was created so, just as he was created with eyes and ears, and two feet.

Such holiness is clearly possible before moral action. If not it is forever impossible; for holiness is the work of God anyway, and if he can not produce a right trend to the nature by creation, how can He do it by grace? Whatever nature might become by good conduct and redeeming grace, that it might be constituted in original creation. Constantly bear in mind that it is the primitive nature of Adam that we are discussing, not his character. Character is made, and as yet he had no character. But we are saying that his nature was in harmony with the nature of his creator. All his aptitudes and appetences were toward the right, just as we may suppose is the case with all the holy angels. The spontaneous tendencies grow out of the NATURE and Adam's nature was holy, because free from all wayward lawless tendencies. It was natural for him to do right, as it is natural for an apple tree to bear apples. The quality of a tree is shown by the quality of its fruit. Likewise the deeds of men correspond to their nature. The need of regeneration depends on this truth. The transformation of the life that attends regeneration is produced by the renewal of the moral nature. "Thus," says Miley, "it appears that the question of primitive holiness, is not a merely speculative

one, but one which vitally concerns the deepest truth and reality of regeneration. If there be no moral quality of our nature, then regeneration loses its meaning for the Christian life. Hence Adam as newly created could be holy in his nature" (Vol. I, p. 413).

II. PROOFS OF PRIMITIVE HOLINESS.

1. From the nature of God. Man is a moral being, and was made so at the beginning. That means that he was endowed with moral faculties necessary to moral personality-intellect, sensibility and free will. Without such a moral nature man is not a man.

Now God is holy. We cannot suppose that a holy God would have created an unholy race with natural propensities going out spontaneously to the evil instead of the good. The new Adam was precisely what God made him; consequently his spontaneous tendencies, expressive of his innermost nature, must have been pleasing to God, and in harmony with divine goodness. His moral inclination must naturally have been to the good in preference to the evil, and this is the real nature of holiness.

2. From the Scriptures. "And God saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was very good" (Gen. 1: 31). This is said immediately after the creation of man. It does violence to the text, to say that it has no reference to man's moral nature, as some do, in the interest of their speculations.

"Lo, this have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions" (Ecc. 7: 29). The only natural meaning of the word "upright" here is rectitude or moral nature with its spontaneous tendencies.

"And that ye put on the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness."

"And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him (Eph. 4: 24 and Col. 3: 10). The central truth of these texts is the transformation of man from an evil to a good life. The old man which must be put off is a corrupt nature with vicious practices; and the new man which must be put on is a holy nature and a good life. This purification wrought by the Holy Spirit is a renewal of the soul in the image of God in which man was originally created. Hence in that image there is the truth of a primitive holiness.

3. ERRORS OF AUGUSTINE AND PELAGIUS. Here we quote a very critical worthy passage from Miley-abbreviating somewhat. "In the great contention between Augustine and Pelagius each went to an extreme; the former in the maintenance of original sin in the sense of native demerit; the latter in the denial of native depravity. Both failed to make the proper distinction between moral character from personal conduct, and the subjective moral state (or nature). With an omission of the proper analysis, native depravity was with Augustine native sin and demerit. On the other hand, Pelagius, equally overlooking that distinction, and holding the impossibility of demerit without one's own personal conduct, denied the truth of native depravity. With the proper analysis, Augustine might have maintained the whole truth of native depravity, without the element of sinful demerit; while Pelagius might have held the same truth of depravity and yet have maintained his

fundamental principle, that free personal conduct absolutely conditions all sinful demerit. We thus point out the opposite extremes and the opposite errors of the two parties.

Other errors logically followed. If all men might be sinners with the desert of punishment by virtue of an inherited depravity, Adam could have the moral worth and rewardableness of an eminent saint simply by virtue of an original creation. This is the tendency of Augustine's Anthropology. On the other hand, the denial of primitive holiness on the part of Pelagius was logically consequent to his denial of Augustine's doctrine of original sin. His denial of native sin carried with it the denial of native depravity. On such a principle there can be no moral quality of a nature, and therefore, no primitive holiness" (Vol. I, pp. 416, 417).

The thoughtful student will notice that both these combatants were partly right and partly wrong. Neither had the full truth Augustine fathered Calvinism; Pelagius helped to produce modern liberalism. The truth lies between the two, as held by the best Methodism. Pelagius denied all change in the moral state or nature of the race, as the result of Adam's fall.

It will be seen, then, that the denial of primitive holiness is not a merely speculative error, but one that carries with it momentous consequences. It carries with it the denial of the Adamic fall, and the depravity of the race, and therefore leaves no place for an evangelical, Scriptural theology. There is no longer any need of an atonement, or regeneration, or justification by faith, or sanctification, or a new life in Christ. The tap-root of all sound theology is the sin question, and goes back to the garden of Eden and the fall of man from primitive holiness. A theology that is weak here is weak everywhere, and worse than worthless.

III. ELEMENTS OF PRIMITIVE HOLINESS. 1. The Romish Church teaches that "original righteousness is not a natural, but a supernatural endowment." "As to his material body he was immortal and impossible, not by the force of nature itself, but by a divine favor." "As to his soul, He formed him after His own image and likeness, endowed him with free will, and so tempered within him all the emotions of his mind and his appetites that they would never disobey the rule of reason. Then He added the admirable gift of original righteousness." "Thus in the Papal Anthropology the likeness and image of God in primitive man carried the sense of a similarity in the nature and personality of mind, but not the sense of holiness. Place was thus left for primitive holiness as a supernatural endowment." "There is no ground for the exclusively supernatural character of primitive holiness. Further, the doctrine implies that the fall of man was simply a lapse into his primitive state. The fall in its effect upon man, apart from personal demerit, was simply a deprivation of the supernatural endowment of righteousness. His own nature was the same after the fall as before it. This is a very superficial and false view of the actual state of man in consequence of the Adamic fall" (Miley, p. 419).

2. The elements of the true doctrine.

The first element of primitive holiness was the moral rectitude of the Adamic nature as newly created. The nature was so constituted as to be responsive to the claims of God in the sense of a SPONTANEOUS INCLINATION or DISPOSITION toward fulfillment. This is all that we can properly mean by primitive holiness.

There was a second element, or addition to it, viz., the presence and help of the Holy Spirit. The Adamic nature was holy in itself, yet needed the help of the Spirit. Man was made for the society of God, and Adam had it freely. The life-energizing presence and power of the Spirit is what Jesus promised to His children, as the supreme grace this side of heaven. We may well believe that this was lost by the fall. So the peculiarly precious constant presence and keeping influence of the Holy Spirit was lost. Depravation of nature and deprivation of the Spirit consummated man's ruin.

We might represent this to the eye somewhat as follows:

Before the Fall. man had 23% Conscience 25% Reason 25% Sensibility 25% Will-power + The Holy Spirit
After the Fall. man has 15% Conscience 15% Reason 15% Will-power 55% Sensibility - The Holy Spirit - Before the fall there was a keen conscience, a clear-eyed reason, a dominant will power, and correct, submissive sensibilities- a harmonious balance of faculties, aided and guided by the Holy Spirit. After the fall, conscience was less keen; the vision of reason to see duty was not so clear; the power of will was less kingly and supreme; the sensibilities were abnormally developed, unsubmitive to reason and will, and clamoring for self-indulgence. And, saddest of all, the blessed communion and intimate companionship of the Holy Spirit was lost.

IV. THE PRIMITIVE PROBATION.

Probation is a state of trial under a law of duty. The law tests the spirit of obedience. The duty imposed is enforced by the sanctions of rewards and penalties. These sanctions determine for the subjects of probation permanent states of good or evil; so that probation is a temporary trial. The central fact of probation is personal responsibility for conduct under a law of duty.

1. The probation of Adam was natural and reasonable. While he was holy and had a perfect balance of faculties and powers, yet he was possessed of sensibilities which might be at any time the inlet of temptation. In temptation there is an impulse of the sensibilities adverse to the law of duty as perceived by the reason. Such a trial therefore, was natural, may we not say, inevitable to Adam. In such a state he began his moral life, with natural solicitations to evil which he was well able to resist. He was able to stand yet free to fall. The only way to the permanent blessedness of a confirmed moral character was by the temporary endurance of temptation and a persistent obedience. But obedience requires a law of duty; and probation means the natural incident of trial with the possibility of failure, under a testing law.

2. There was complete ability for obedience. It consisted in the rectitude of a fully endowed moral nature. Adam's sons with their deranged moral nature countless myriads of times have endured fiercer temptations than came to him in his holy state. With susceptibility to temptation through his sensibility, his spontaneous disposition was yet entirely favorable to good rather than evil. If his moral constitution was what Scripture teaches us it was, the fulfillment of his duty was easily within reach of his power. The heir of such a rich endowment of faculties, in communion with his Maker, and with the prize of eternal blessedness before him, our first parent owed it to himself and to the gracious Author of his being to do his duty and to refrain from sin.

3. Some ask, why was sin permitted?

We might ask with far more propriety, why were moral beings created at all? God might have filled the universe with stones; but what significance would there be in an infinity of dirt? The Heavenly Father wanted moral beings like Himself that could enjoy Him, and whom He could enjoy. But moral beings must have moral faculties with susceptibility to temptation and with the power of choice between good and evil. So the necessity of temptation and the possibility of sin and woe and death is an essential condition of the blessedness of moral being. We cannot have the privilege of sonship with God without paying the price.

V. The Probationary Law.

God as Moral Ruler, had, as one of his prerogatives, a perfect right to select such a form of trial as He pleased, so that the test of obedience was not unjust. From the very nature of man, the temptation must come through the sensibility, by some appeal to a natural propensity, innocent in itself, but whose gratification was forbidden by divine command. The test was such as commended itself to infinite wisdom, and we are not to question its propriety. Presumably Adam had had a limited experience; but he had such moral intuitions as furnished him with ample reasons to trust and obey his Maker. We all have occasion to trust God when we cannot understand the purpose He has in view, or the wisdom of His ways. In the goodness of God there is infinite warrant for our confidence even when the meaning of His purpose is hidden from our view.

Adam, doubtless, had the common duties of us all, those pertaining to love, reverence and worship. Such moral laws must exist for all moral beings. But one commandment was peculiarly adapted to test his loyalty. Commandments are of two kinds—moral commandments, and positive commandments. The moral commandments are those, the reason of which you know, being revealed by your own moral intuitions. The obligation to obey the moral law is plain and absolute.

Positive commandments 'are those whose full reasons you do not know. The obligation to obey rests entirely on the sacred authority of the divine command. There is, however, a just presumption that there is a worthy reason for every positive command of God, even though we may not know what it is. It is fair to suppose that an infinitely wise God has good reasons for all He does, and that any positive command is no arbitrary mandate of an absolute will, indifferent to morality and piety. But such a command certainly was the best suited for a moral trial, and the event proved it to be so.

VI. THE PROBATION WAS PERFECTLY FAIR.

1. The command was perfectly plain. There was nothing difficult to understand in the duty enjoined. It was simply the duty of abstinence from the fruit of one particular tree, definitely pointed out.
2. Adam was not unduly pressed to disobedience by any vicious appetite, or fierce tyrannical habit. His nature was perfectly healthy and free from any inordinate passion.
3. He was not pressed by the dire cravings of an innocent but long denied appetite. The garden in which he dwelt was rich in beauty and plenty. There was in it "every tree that is pleasant to the

sight and good for food." He was not a famished man, driven to eat by the insanity of hunger. His needs were supplied, and all his lawful appetites were sated with plenty.

4. He was blessed with communion with God, and he knew that the command was directly from Him. He was aware of the divine goodness and greatness and glory. The test Was as simple as it could well have been made. There was, .therefore, no possible excuse for disobedience, as there never is any real and valid excuse for sin.

* * * * *

CHAPTER VI -- THE FALL

An eloquent preacher said a few years 'ago that man's only fall was a fall upward. It is in such flashy, flippancy of language that modern infidelity clothes itself. But man is a fallen being just the same. All human history proves it. Notice.

I. The Circumstances of the Fall,

1. There was an animal used by a higher agency. We will pass over all the fanciful interpretations of this remarkable passage of Scripture. Treating it in the most natural way as plain matter of fact history, there was a superior intelligence at work in the temptation, one who knew God, and had a knowledge of the divine command, and was able to reason with craft and cunning, and knew about good and evil, and could outwit Eve. There is no open reference to Satanic agency; but there was a malignant cunning displayed which plainly points to him and his "devices."

This may be plainly inferred from other Scriptures. Indeed this seems to be the underlying idea of the Bible that Satan caused the downfall of the race. He is depicted as a murderer, and a liar from the beginning and there is no truth in him (John 8: 44). He is "that old serpent, called the devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world" (Rev. 12: 9). "But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve in his craftiness, your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity and the purity that is toward Christ" (2 Cor. 11: 3). There can be no question that the temptation in the garden by Satan is the underlying thought of these passages of Scripture.

2. Notice the method of the temptation.

The subtlety of the Devil is apparent in the whole process. First Eve was tempted when alone and her downfall would be easier of accomplishment. Second, a subtile suggestion is made against the fairness of the restriction placed upon them. Third, suspicion was placed on the veracity of God. Fourth, the penalty of sin was flatly denied. "Ye shall not surely die." "Eve was assured that there was great advantage in knowing good and evil. Thus their, or her, reverence for God! and confidence in His wisdom and goodness and love were aroused to possess the Godlike knowledge, and through the awakened desire for a new experience she fell, and carried her husband with her into disobedience. It was the saddest knowledge ever gained.

3. The penalty.

Death had been announced to them as the penalty of disobedience. A Congregational preacher of London of unenviable reputation, in one of his infidel books, sneers at this story of the fall, and calls this sin a "mere peccadillo." It is ever so. Cheap theology always gets on the Devil's side of the sin question. But any sin is no peccadillo, however, whenever, wherever, or by whomsoever committed. Sin is the fatal gangrene, the consuming leprosy of the moral universe. "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die"; "For the wages of sin is death."

There is in the law no explanation of this term death. We must find its meaning in subsequent Scripture, and in the after condition of the race. The term seems to have meant:

(1) Physical death. Apparently there was a provision for perpetual life, as the heritage of man. By this we mean exemption from death as we know it by sickness, and pangs, and agony and dread. As we have noted elsewhere God might have removed His children to their eternal home by translation as He did Elijah, or by some other delightful way. Death as we know it—the terror of the race would have been unknown. "This was provided for by the tree of life, probably by a sacramental use of its fruit." But through the first sin came expulsion from the tree of life and the sad penalty of physical death.

(2) There is also a spiritual death, as distinguished from the spiritual life which man originally had, and which comes back only through grace. The Scriptures speak of a moral death of being "dead in trespasses and sins" (Eph. 2:1). It consists in a separation of the soul from communion with God, and is manifested by the corrupt dispositions and habits and carnal tendencies of the soul, as utter aversion to spiritual and heavenly things. All who have not been made alive by regeneration are now regarded as in that death. Such was now the state of Adam and Eve. "With the full execution of the penalty this death must have been utter. But it is reasonable to think that in this case, as in that of physical death, there was a partial arrest of judgment, or an instant gift of helping grace, through the redemptive mediation at once inaugurated" (Miley).

(3) There is still a third sense of the term—that of eternal death. This subject will have ample discussion hereafter. But for the present it is sufficient to call to mind the fact that eternal death is the final penal allotment of the unsaved. It means that the present separation from God's Spirit will be intensified, into complete and absolute alienation that will be prolonged eternally. And the divine displeasure with the wicked will also have some especial manifestation.

4. We may remark here that the primal sin of our first parents had a race-wide consequence. This will be directly considered in the following chapter. But, by the sin of Adam his whole physical, mental and moral nature was demoralized, injured and depraved. When he came to propagate the human family, he could not reproduce in them the primitive holiness. That was forever lost. When he begat sons and daughters "in his likeness" they were born in depravity, the only nature he could give them.

The Congregational infidel of London may say with a sneer: "Why should God feel Himself so much aggrieved by Adam's peccadillo? If it were not for the theological atmosphere which surrounds the question we should see at once that it was ridiculous. The doctrine of the Fall is an absurdity from the point of view of ethical consistency and common sense." Let us hear from one wiser in theology: "Sin begets depravity. It degrades and corrupts, if it does not possess the whole

man. It bears sway in soul and body, becomes an evil habit, gathering strength with time-self-perpetuating. Though not a disease it works like a disease in its hidden depths, blinding the mind, hardening the heart, exciting inordinate passions, producing infirmity, misery, despair and death. From its evil effects none can deliver himself" (Hyde). Another shall speak: "That sin exists, not only in idea or fancy, but in fact, is even more evident in common life than in Scripture. We find it in the plays of children; in genius, wit and culture; in arts and fashions; in feasts, speeches, songs, novels, dramas; in secret haunts, public offices, the pursuits of money, honor, pleasure; in the daily papers, popular books, all the records of falsehood, discord, vice and crime. Without it, comedy and tragedy would not be true to life, laws and penalties, courts and prisons, indeed the whole world's history would be a shocking farce. We can learn much about it from Plato as well as from Paul, from Byron, Dickens, Hawthorne, Shakespeare, as truly as from Moses, David or Jesus Christ. Is sin a fact? I wish you could enter into a more thorough, out and out conviction of the FALL OF MAN" (Bushnell). "Nor is sin restricted to any individual, family or tribe. So far as observation or history can tell, it attaches to the race. Its presence everywhere confronts or haunts us. Hebrew ethics, looks evil earnestly and squarely in the face, and regards it as a sad, all-prevalent reality, the guilt of which lies in the free act of man and is participated in by all without exception" (Wuttke). "The race was not liable to the original penalty (of Adam's sin) in the same manner as its progenitors who transgressed the law; yet it is in a state of moral depravity, and subject to death in consequence of their sin and fall. This is the teaching of Scripture" (Miley).

II. MAN FREE TO FALL, CONTRARY TO THE WILL OF GOD.

1. There is an old catechism which declares: "God from all eternity did by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass." We cannot say which is the greater, the moral monstrosity or the absurdity of such a statement. The infinite holiness and goodness of God make it incredible that He decreed the sin and consequent misery of the fall. That He should unchangeably foreordain that moral beings should break His own commands is unthinkable. He must have electively preferred obedience. "The contrary is not to be thought, for God's preference of obedience must always go with his command." Obedience would have brought holiness and happiness. It is absurd to suppose that a holy God of love could prefer sin, and the ruin and consequent misery of a race.

2. It must be a rational principle with God that the preference of obedience is accompanied by the ability of obedience.

Much more rational is it to suppose that the command of God implies the possibility or the requisite faculties to obey. Therefore, Adam and Eve must have had the needed gifts to obey God. They were on probation, being tempted or tested, and what was being tested but their use of their faculties actually possessed. When the government sends an officer of the navy to test a newly made war vessel he does not test what is not there; he tests the machinery actually in the ship. Timothy Dwight truly said "that a state of trial supposes of course a capability of falling, and cannot exist without it"; but with equal truth it may be said that a state of trial presupposes ability to stand. POWER TO STAND and FREEDOM TO FALL! It may be said, then, with absolute certainty that God is eternally opposed to sin. He does not decree it, nor desire it; nor is He responsible for it in any way. But in a moral universe there must be free moral beings, and sin must forever be a possibility. This is the only philosophy that can be in harmony with the facts of the

moral universe. There is a holy God, and there are moral beings, and sin is here. It must have come through the finite moral beings who were free to fall.

III. How HOLY BEINGS SIN.

How can a holy being fall? This question is often asked, often with a sneer at people who profess holiness. President Noah Porter said: "The existence of sin is the one comprehensive mystery." There are perplexing questions that may be asked about the matter; but the fall of a holy being may yet be explained psychologically. Cheap intellects sneer at the Bible account of the fall, but it has been observed that the Mosaic narrative of the sin and fall of man is not the cause of the prevalent moral evils, but simply the account of its origin in the human race. There is no more rational account. Set it aside with sneers and laughter, and what has been accomplished? We still have sin on our hands to be accounted for. Its reality, its malignity, its magnitude are still the same. Either God created man sinful or he has fallen from a state of primitive holiness. The former view is unreasonable; the latter must be the truth, and harmonizes with the despised Scripture. It implies the sinning of holy beings. How did they sin?

Let it be remembered that our first parents possessed intellect, sensibility and free will. The first two are aroused necessarily in the presence of the appropriate object that excites them. Here were the susceptibilities to temptation-"a ground of temptability."

When the tempter called Eve's attention to the forbidden fruit, "the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise; she took of the fruit thereof and did eat." The woman fixed her attention. What she saw with her eyes and heard with her ears enlisted her thought, aroused her desires, awakened appetencies. So far all is spontaneous and innocent, and quite consistent with primitive holiness. But these spontaneous thoughts and feelings, in view of God's known command, were unduly entertained, and became perilous. The entertained desire by nursing grew into a lust. "Then the lust when it hath conceived beareth sin" (James 1: 15). Eve consented to entertain her desire till it became so strong that, under its influence, she made the fatal sin-jid choice.

There were moral forces at Eve's command, quite available. She might have taken more time to deliberate. She might have consulted with her husband about it. She might have summoned the motive of reverence for God's authority and love for His goodness, as a practical power leading to obedience. She might have brought to her aid motives of fear-the awful consequences of disobedience -the threatened penalty of death, that awaited her if she rebelled against God. But every helpful influence failed, because she did not summon them to her aid and give them time to make their due impression. She acted precipitately, foolishly and fell. No doubt by a similar process the angels fell, and any holy being may fall.

IV. Why God Permitted The Fall.

He did not permit it in the following senses:

1. By consenting to it. The deed was expressly forbidden, and the heaviest penalties were pronounced against it. A civilized state cannot be said to permit murder when it forbids it, and punishes it with the death penalty.

2. He did not permit it in the sense of "unchangeably ordaining" it. To say that He "unchangeably ordained" the fall, and then solemnly forbade it, and pronounced against it the death-penalty, is to array God against Himself. It is theological fiction, and not fact-Calvinistic tomfoolery!

3. The only sense in which God did permit the sin of our first parents, or any sin is that HE DID NOT SOVEREIGNLY AND EFFECTIVELY INTERPOSE TO PREVENT IT BY FORCE. A father might forbid his boys to steal. And then, to make sure that they did not, he might hand-cuff them and chain them to posts in his dwelling. But the state would arrest and punish such a father for tyranny. So God could not forcibly restrain the moral beings he has created from the commission of sin without unjustifiable tyranny.

We cannot say that it was not permissible in God to create a moral universe. That would be to put bounds and restraints on the Almighty and limit His creative work to the sphere of impersonal existences. "Only a most arrogant and daring mind could prescribe such limitations for God, or deny Him the rightful privilege of creating moral beings capable of a worshipful recognition of Himself" (Miley). Our very greatness and essential glory in which we rejoice is fraught with peril, of which we cannot consistently complain.

Even God could not release such moral beings as we are, endowed with such faculties, from duty and responsibility. We cannot impugn God's wisdom and goodness in making us as He has, or in governing us as He does. In the very nature of the case, such beings must have a probation, and the essential fact of probation under a testing law of duty is moral responsibility, and the possibility of sin. To say that the existence of sin and its consequent misery is inconsistent with the goodness of God is equivalent to saying that it was inconsistent with His goodness to create moral beings at all.

"There was in our first parents, the knowledge that to eat the forbidden fruit was wrong, forbidden by the highest wisdom and goodness. They yielded in spite of the protests of their better knowledge. Sin, as we know it, is precisely the same. The tendency to self-gratification against the protests of reason in our first parents, was like that in all their children, and the yielding to this impulse, in opposition to a better knowledge, is still the same" (Fair-child's Theology, p. 156).

Now such flagrant, open, willful disobedience, against the dictates of reason merits punishment. This is the verdict of conscience within us. And if the punishment be just the permission of the sin was not unjust, "The obedient who reap the rich harvest of spiritual good and the disobedient, who suffer the penalty of sin, are under the same moral economy. If that economy be right to the one it can not be wrong to the other. If the moral economy be righteous there can be no requirement of providence sovereignly to prevent the sin which forfeits the blessing" (Miley, p. 438).

4. THE FALL AND REDEMPTION.

It is often said by theologians that "God permitted the fall of man that He might provide a redemption for the race so ruined, and through its grace and love bring a far greater good to the

moral universe and especially to the human race." Mr. Wesley thought that this view cleared the question of the fall of all perplexity, so far as it concerned the divine wisdom and goodness. The argument is that through the atonement in Christ, rendered necessary by the fall, mankind has gained a higher capacity for holiness and happiness in the present life and also for eternal blessedness (Sermon 64).

This is not the most logical and helpful way of stating the case. God permitted sin because, as we have seen, he could not wisely and righteously prevent it. Having created moral beings, he must let them be moral beings, free to work out their own destiny as self-sovereigns, exempt from external compulsion. Beings cannot be moral beings at all without the possibility of choice between right and wrong, and so without the possibility of sinning. Let us hold fast to this fundamental truth.

But it is still true that the fall did open the way for, and give occasion to, the great plan of redemption. And this work of redemption has brought additional glory to God, and the possibility of increased blessing to men. If Satan, out of his intense hatred to God, hoped to tarnish his glory by achieving the ruin of man, he defeated himself.

(1) So far as we can see, had there been no sin in the universe, God never could have made a full and perfect manifestation of His character and glory. Calvary is the only adequate measure of the divine love. Without the fall of man the radiance of God's forgiving love would never have shone on human hearts. What conception could we ever have had of the divine pity or sympathy, or compassion, or mercy or grace? Only as human "sin abounded" could divine "grace much more abound." Redeemed saints could never fill heaven with eternal praise of God for their redemption had humanity never been lost. And so it comes about that Satan's foul act of corrupting our first parents, has been so overruled by God that it redounded to His infinite glory by the unexpected and astonishing displays of His hitherto unknown attributes.

(2) It is true also, that the fall with the redeeming grace that accompanied it, has put us all on a better probation than Adam had, and "has provided for man the necessary condition for the development of the graces of patience, meekness, gentleness, long-suffering, which contribute so much to the highest Christian character."

But all this only proves that God overmatched Satan's wickedness and forced him, with all his wicked machinations, however unwillingly, to glorify his Maker. It does not at all prove that He permitted the fall for that purpose. While it is true that the fall occasioned the gift of the Only Begotten Son and the highest manifestations of divine goodness the universe will ever know; and, therefore, the fullest warrant of faith and love. Yet it is also true that the fall weakened our entire race, brought upon it untold misery and will be the eternal ruin of many. We must look at both sides, and all the facts. Then it is not so clear that the fall was permitted "to bring infinite gain to the race." We may, however, affirm that the fall was not unwisely prevented by force, and was overruled and made subservient to the glory of God and the eternal good of an infinite number of the finally redeemed.

Theologians must be conscientiously careful to be consistent in their arguments. "If the fall was permissible for the sake of a greater good to the race, why might it not have been procured for the same end? The theory must thus appear to be in open contrariety to the divine holiness. This result

discredits it; for not even the love of God must be glorified at the expense of His holiness. Nor is it within the grasp of human thought that sin, the greatest evil can be necessary to the greatest good of the moral universe. It is still true that an unmeasurable good will arise from the; atonement in Christ; but it is not the sense of Scripture that it was part of a providential economy for the sake of that good" (Miley, Vol. I, p. 439).

V. The fall of the angels, is more difficult to explain than that of Adam. They had a more glorious intelligence, a larger acquaintance with God, and a greater experience of His holiness. Their sin was so excuseless and wantonly wicked, that it seemed not good to God to make an atonement for them. But there must have been the same underlying principles, viz., the possession of moral attributes, a probation, the power of choice, ability to stand, and freedom to fall. There, was one marked difference. Each angel stood for himself alone; Adam was to be the progenitor of a race, each member of which was to suffer through him a lapse from holiness.

* * * * *

CHAPTER VII -- EFFECT OF THE FALL UPON THE RACE

Adam, as the first, was father of the race, whatever affected his nature, affected the nature of his descendants. By the simple law of heredity or race connection, the injured nature of Adam would be passed on to his offspring. It is a righteous and beneficent law-an expression of the infinite wisdom of God. It helps to propagate good qualities as well as bad, and so blesses as well as curse men. We cannot condemn the law without condemning God; and in practical life we could not get along without it. We must accept the evil effects if we would have the good.

Now in a way the trial and fall of our first parents was the trial and fall of the race. It was a trial of a good specimen of human nature under favorable conditions. To God it was not an experiment. He foresaw the result; but it was necessary that such an experiment should be made, and such an exhibition of human nature should be given to the world to justify the ways of God to men.

"At once there was a change in God's treatment of the race, penalty was visited upon them for their disobedience. A sterner discipline was adopted-a treatment better fitted to a weak and temptable and sinful race. The conditions of Eden were good to begin with, but not to continue; and thus our first parents were sent out of the garden and subjected to new conditions of hardship, labor, suffering, toil and death; and the race went with them into these stern conditions. The change must be accepted as a token of God's displeasure; yet it was rather disciplinary than penal. A promise was added, with the expulsion from Eden, and hope encouraged, God's providence and care over His sinful creatures was continued; and the work of regeneration and redemption of man went on.

This was the fall of man, a fall into a depressed and painful condition. On the part of our first parents, it was a fall into sin; on the part of the race, it was a coming down from ease and external blessedness, bordering on heaven and immortal life, to hardship, suffering and death. Under these stern conditions the race has been propagated, and has existed, from that day to this. Every man is born to a heritage of hardship and evil; and every man as he enters upon moral agency, falls into sin. The evidence is that this condition of hardship is appropriate to a temptable and sinful race, that the ease and pleasantness of Eden was unfavorable. The trial or experiment of Eden was

necessary at the beginning; otherwise men might have had occasion to call in question God's wisdom and goodness.

All the descendants of Adam inherit his weak and temptable nature, and in their turn fall under temptation and sin, and thus come into condemnation; "And so death passed upon all men for that all have sinned." Men are a fallen race not simply because Adam sinned, but because "all have sinned and have come short of the glory of God." We receive then, from Adam, by natural generation, our weak and temptable nature, by which we sin and come into condemnation; and also, this depressed condition of the race, involving all the trials and hardships and discipline of life, and finally death itself" (Fairchild's Theology, pp. 156, 157).

I. We here meet the phrase-original sin.

In Augustinian anthropology, original sin includes: 1. A common guilt of Adam's sin; 2. A common native depravity as the consequence of that guilt; and 3. A sinfulness of the depravity which in all men deserves both temporal and eternal punishment. Webster defines it as "The imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, or a natural corruption and tendency to sin inherited from him."

An old Calvinistic Confession says: "By this sin (of our first parents) they, and we in them, fell from original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body. They being the root, and by God's appointment standing in the room and stead of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed, and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity descending from them by ordinary generation. From this original corruption whereby we are utterly Indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions. Every sin, both original and actual, being a transgression of the righteous law of God, and contrary thereunto doth in its own nature bring guilt upon the sinner, whereby he is bound over to the wrath of God, and curse of the law, and so made subject to death, with all miseries, spiritual, temporal and eternal."

This is the doctrine of original sin as usually held by Calvinistic writers. Unfortunately it has been borrowed by many Methodist theologians. Ralston says (p. 120), "We believe the most rational and Scriptural view of the subject is, that Adam, in the transaction of the fall, was the federal head and proper legal representative of his posterity, in-so-much that they fell in him as truly, in view of the law as he fell himself; and that the consequences of the first sin are visited upon them, as a penal infliction, for the guilt of Adam imputed to them. That such was the relation of Adam to his posterity we think can be satisfactorily shown." Then he labors through forty pages to show it to his own satisfaction. But two hundred and thirty pages later in his theology in Chapters XXIX and XXX, finding his doctrine of "Imputation" an inconvenient burden he throws it all overboard, and says there is no such thing. On page 388, he says: "We remark, in reference to impute and imputation that these terms are never used as implying the imputation of something possessed by, or done by, one person to another as his own. But, on the contrary, these words are always spoken in reference to something possessed or performed by the person to whom the imputation is made. Thus it is said, "Abraham believed God, and it (the faith of Abraham) was imputed to him for righteousness." Again: But to him that worketh not, but believeth, his faith is imputed to him for righteousness"-that is, his own faith, and not the faith of another man. On page 389, he says: "To come home to the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, I answer, first, that either to say that the

righteousness of Christ is imputed to his posterity (of believers) or the sin of Adam to his, are both expressions at least unknown to the Holy Ghost in the Scriptures. There is neither word, nor syllable, nor letter, nor title, of any such thing to be found there." Methodist theologians need to be exceedingly careful about adopting any of the peculiar phrases or fictions of Calvinism into their writings. They are sure to bring them trouble afterward; for they can not possibly be any consistent portion of Methodist theology.

Now that we have mentioned this strange doctrine of imputation, which is in the mouth and writings of so many theologians, we will finish the discussion of it.

We have examined every passage in the Bible where the word occurs, and in every case it is a man's own character or conduct that is imputed to him, and not some other person's. Dr. Albert Barnes, the Bible commentator of blessed memory in his "Romans" 4: 3 declares that there is not a passage in the Old or New Testament where the word impute means to transfer one person's moral desert to another. He says: "The word is never used to denote charging that on one which does not properly belong to him." He was a mild Calvinist; but he was too honest not to admit this truth. This is precisely what we might expect. If there is anything in the moral, universe that is strictly personal and private it is moral character. Nobody's sin or holiness can by any possibility be charged up against or credited to anybody else. Yet this absurd notion has filled the theologies for centuries.

President Fairchild comments thus: "Nor is it implied that the sin of Adam is imputed to his posterity in the sense that it is regarded as theirs. Sin belongs to him who commits it; and it cannot in any proper sense be charged to another. The least offensive form of this imputation is, that the sin of Adam is charged to his posterity, not in the sense that the unworthiness or wickedness is theirs, but the guilt, or liability to punishment is imputed to them. This imputation is supposed to be the ground upon which God gives to Adam's posterity by a sovereign act, a corrupt nature. The corrupt nature is sinful, ill-deserving, and all its motions are necessarily sinful; and thus men fall under the wrath and curse of God. The ground of this supposed imputation is, by some, held to be that Adam was the natural and federal head of the race; that by God's appointment he acted for his posterity. His acts are properly attributed to them, and they are held responsible, in a legal sense-not responsible for all the sins of Adam, nor for the sins of our ancestors generally, but only for the first sin. This it is claimed, was in accordance with a special covenant, or appointment, of God. The view is too formal and mechanical and arbitrary; it lacks the character of naturalness and reasonableness, and could be accepted, if at all, only on the ground of a positive revelation. It cannot be shown that we have any such revelation" (Theology, pp. 158, 159).

Finney, with his unsparing logic wrote of imputation as follows: "I could not receive that THEOLOGICAL FICTION OF IMPUTATION. First my teacher maintained that the guilt of Adam's first transgression is literally imputed to all his posterity; so that they are justly sentenced and exposed to eternal damnation for Adam's sin. Secondly, he maintained that we receive from Adam by natural generation, a nature wholly sinful, and morally corrupt in every faculty of soul and body; so that we are totally unable to perform any act acceptable to God, and are necessitated by our sinful natures to transgress his laws in every action of our lives. And this, he insisted, is the state into which all men fell by the first sin of Adam. For this sin of nature thus received from Adam by natural generation, all mankind are sentenced to, and are deserving of eternal damnation.

Thirdly, he maintained that we are all justly condemned and sentenced to eternal damnation for our own unavoidable transgressions of the law. Thus we find ourselves justly subject to a triple eternal damnation!"

"Then the second branch of this wonderful imputation is as follows:

1. The sin of all the elect, both original and actual—that is, the guilt of Adam's sin together with the guilt of their sinful nature, and also the guilt of their personal transgressions, are all literally" imputed to Christ; and therefore the divine government regarded Him as an embodiment of all the sins and guilt of the elect; and treated Him accordingly; that is, the Father punished the Son precisely as much as all the elect deserved. Hence their debt being thus fully discharged by the punishment of Christ, they are saved upon principles of exact justice."

"The third branch of this WONDERFUL THEOLOGICAL FICTION is as follows:

First, The obedience of Christ to the divine law is literally imputed to the elect; so that in him they are regarded as always having perfectly obeyed the laws.

Second, His death for them is also imputed to the elect; so that in him they are regarded as having fully suffered all that they deserve on account of the guilt of Adam's sin imputed to them, and also on account of their sinful nature, and also on account of all their personal transgressions.

Third. Thus by their surety the elect have perfectly obeyed the law; and then they have by their surety suffered full penalty to which they were subject in consequence of Adam's sin imputed to them, and also the guilt of their sinful nature, and still further their blameworthiness for their personal transgressions. Thus they were punished in Christ as if they had not obeyed in him. He FIRST perfectly obeys for them, which obedience is strictly imputed to them, so that they are regarded by the government of God as having fully obeyed in their surety; SECOND, He has suffered for them the penalty of the law, just as if no obedience had been rendered; THIRD, after the law had been doubly satisfied, the elect are still required to repent as if no satisfaction had been rendered FOURTH, payment in full having been rendered twice over, the discharge of the elect is claimed to be an act of infinite grace. Thus the elect are saved by grace, on principles of justice, so that strictly there is no grace or mercy in our forgiveness, but the whole grace of our salvation is found in the obedience and suffering of Christ.

It follows that the elect may demand their discharge on the score of strict justice. They need not pray for pardon or forgiveness; it is all a mistake. This inference is my own; but it follows, as every one can see, irresistibly, from what the confession of faith itself asserts, that the elect are saved on principles of exact and perfect justice" (Finney's Autobiography, pp. 56-58).

Surely nothing more is needed to show the utter absurdity of this doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin, and of Christ's righteousness. Nothing but the supposed exigencies of a system of theology would lead men to believe that countless billions of immortal beings could be considered worthy of, and liable to, eternal damnation for the guilt of one sin committed before they were born, and arbitrarily imputed to them. There is not a millionth of a probability that a holy God would treat moral beings in that way.

Dr. Daniel Steele was once asked (question 904): "In what sense were Adam and Eve created holy? And how did they before they sinned differ from infants?" Answer: "They had no leaning toward sin. This is negative holiness. To have positive holiness they must make it their choice. They chose sin, and did not become positively holy under the dispensation of law, but we trust they did under the dispensation of grace, foreshadowed in the promise of the Savior. None of the descendants of Adam-save the second Adam-have had a concreated, or negative, purity. BUT THIS DEFECT DOES NOT ENTAIL GUILT IN THE NEW BORN INFANT, as a hard and severe theology once taught, although it still lingers in some belated creeds. Where sin abounds in its effects, grace does now under the atonement much more abound in its conditional blessings. Positive holiness is within the reach of every believer in Christ, and is freely bestowed upon every infant denied a probation." Amen! In other words, there is no imputation of the guilt of Adam's sin upon the infant or anybody.

Men have recoiled from this horrible doctrine of imputation into infidelity in vast numbers. Others have accepted the doctrine and been swept by its logical consequences into antinomian-ism. What could be more reasonable? If Christ obeyed for us, why do we need to obey? If his holiness is imputed to us why do we need to be holy? Calvinists have imbibed the idea of "a finished salvation for all the elect"-finished in the plans of God from all eternity, and effected on Calvary, so that their sins were forgiven before they committed them, and "they were justified and sanctified and glorified before they were born."

John Fletcher pieced together the following confession of faith from the writings of a "plain spoken Calvinist" of his day, and there is much of this kind of thought in the minds of Calvinists still, for it is a logical inference from their creed, and the writer of these lines has heard it from the lips of living men:

Confession I. "I believe in God the Father Almighty, who from all eternity, unconditionally predestinated me to life, and absolutely chose me to eternal salvation. Whom he once loved he will love forever; I am therefore persuaded (pp. 28-31) that, as he did not set his love on me at first for anything in me, so that love, which is not at all dependent upon anything in me, can never vary on account of my miscarriages; and for this reason when I miscarry, (suppose by adultery or murder) God ever considers me as one with His own Son, who has fulfilled all righteousness for me. And as He is always well pleased with Him so with me, who am absolutely bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh (pp. 26, 31). There are no lengths, then, I may not run, nor any depths I may not fall into, without displeasing Him; as I see in David, who, notwithstanding his repeated backslidings, did not lose the character of the man after God's own heart. I may murder with him, worship Ashtaroth with Solomon, deny Christ with Peter, rob with Onesimus, and commit incest with the Corinthian, without forfeiting either the divine favor or the kingdom of glory. Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? to the charge of a believer? to my charge? For,

II. Pages 26, 27, 32, "I believe in Jesus Christ, that by one offering has forever perfected me, who am sanctified in all my sins: -In Him I am complete in all my iniquities. What is all sin before His atoning blood? Either He has fulfilled the whole law, and borne the curse, or he has not. If he has not, no soul can be saved: If he has, then all debts and claims against His people and me, be they more (suppose a thousand adulteries and so many murders) or be they less, (suppose only one

robbery) be they small, or be they great, be they before or be they after my conversion, are forever and forever, cancelled. I set up no more mountainous distinctions of sin, especially sins after conversion. Whether I am dejected with Elijah under the juniper-tree, or worshipping Milcom with Solomon, whether I mistake the voice of the Lord for that of his priest as Samuel, or defile my neighbor's bed as David; I am equally accepted in the Beloved. For in Christ I am chosen, loved, called, and unconditionally preserved to the end. All these trespasses are forgiven me-I am justified from all things. I already have everlasting life. Nay, I am now (virtually) set down in heavenly places with Christ, and as soon shall Satan pluck His crown from his Head as His purchase from His hand.

Pages 27, 28, "Yes, I avow it in the face of all the world; no falls or backslidings can ever again bring me under condemnation; for Christ hath made me free from the law of sin and death. Should I out sin Manasseh himself, I should not be a less pleasant child; because God always views me IN CHRIST, and IN HIM I am without spot or wrinkle or any such thing. Black in myself, I am still comely through the comeliness put upon me; and therefore, He who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, can, in the midst of all adulteries, murders and incest, address me with, 'Thou art all fair, my love, my undefiled, there is no spot in thee! And,

III. "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Grace, against whom I can never sin (p. 26) whose light and love, I can never quench, to whom I can never do despite, and who, in His good time, will IRRESISTIBLY and INFALLIBLY (Review, p. 38) work in me to will and to do. In the mean time, I am perfectly secure; for I can never perish, MY SALVATION BEING ALREADY FINISHED in the full extent of the expression (Review p. 63)." (Check's Vol. II, pp. 107-109). We could quote pages of similar horrible antinomian teaching, all logically inferred from this wretched Calvinistic "IMPUTATION," "IDENTIFICATION WITH CHRIST," "FINISHED SALVATION," "IRRESISTIBLE GRACE," and "FINAL PERSEVERANCE." We met this teaching in Scotland, the home of Calvinism, where three men at once leaped to their feet and interrupted us in the midst of a sermon, screaming out at the top of their voices, these very doctrines. They were Plymouth Brethren. Mrs. Catherine Booth met these teachings and spoke and wrote against them, as her Biography reveals. Dr. Daniel Steele met them in England. He was asked,- are the doctrines of the Plymouth Brethren Scriptural? If not, wherein lies the error? He answered: "They are the tallest Calvinists who walk the earth of the antinomian type. Their sins, past and future, were all punished on Calvary, hence they do not need to repent, nor to be forgiven. Believers are literally incorporated into Christ's glorified body in heaven, and are perfectly safe, though they constantly commit gross sins. Mr. Darby, their founder, once said to me, 'Jesus Christ, in whom we are incorporated, does not walk about in heaven dropping off fingers and toes.' This is their STANDING. God sees them only in their STANDING, not in their sinful state. They will be judged only in their STANDING in which they are as holy as Christ, because they are parts of Him. Their sins are of no account. Christ's righteousness is IMPUTED to them. By quoting and perverting Scripture they gain converts" (question 2482). Of course such people reject sanctification with one accord. They have sanctification as a STANDING in Christ; therefore, they do not need it as an experience in their own hearts. Let every preacher and teacher and theologian drop the words, impute, and imputation, from his working vocabulary, just as the revisers dropped the words from our revised Bible. Behind them lurk the rankest heresies of theological thought.

We have given the Calvinistic statement of original sin, and pointed out the fallacy of it. Let it be understood, we are not denying the doctrine of depravity. It is the only explanation of the moral history of the race. "It is within us and of us, not as a physical entity, or any form of essential existence, but as a moral condition or state. As such, it is below consciousness, but reveals itself in activities. These are conclusive both of its reality and evil quality. Many things are beyond apprehension in their mode, yet fully certain in their reality. We know not the difference in the inner states of the lion and the lamb; but we know there is a difference which determines the ferocity of the one and the gentleness of the other. So there are differences in the lives of men which lead to the certainty of a difference in their inner states" (Miley, Vol. I, p. 442). There is a something within-a moral condition which determines the difference between the life of the holy Apostle Paul, and the cruel, lustful monster Nero-between the arch-angel Gabriel and Satan. They are all moral beings, having intellect, sensibility and free-will. But there is a something which makes the difference between them. That something is what we are writing about. God is not responsible for it. It is the result of a moral fall. Sane and sound theologians call it MORAL DEPRAVITY. We are not going to surrender the term and the idea it conveys, to satisfy the flippant, and shallow, and profane. It means a deranged state of the spontaneous impulses and dispositions, and an abnormal condition of the moral nature-including conscience and moral reason.

Finney thought that all moral depravity was in the will. What he meant by it seems to have been that the word "moral" ought not to be applied to anything but voluntary acts. He admitted that man's entire nature was in a deranged condition from the fall. He wrote: "Man is not morally but physically depraved. Physical depravity may be predicated of all the powers and involuntary states of body and mind, of the intelligence, of the sensibility, and of the faculty of will. That is, the actions and states of the intelligence may become disordered, depraved, deranged or fallen from a state of integrity and healthiness. The sensibility or feeling department of the mind may be sadly and physically depraved. The appetites and passions, the desires and cravings, the antipathies and repellencies of the feelings fall into great disorder and anarchy. Artificial appetites are generated, and the whole sensibility becomes a wilderness, a chaos of conflicting and, clamorous desires, emotions and passions. The sensibility acts as a powerful impulse to the will, from the moment of birth, and secures the consent and activity of the will before the reason is at all developed. The will is thus committed to the gratification of feeling and appetite when first the idea of moral obligation is developed" (Theology, pp. 250-254).

We need nothing more for our discussion. Finney simply insisted on a technical use of the word moral. He admitted a derangement or depravity of our whole nature from the fall; but he insisted that we make OUR OWN MORAL DEPRAVITY, by our own depraved choices, since nothing should be called moral which is not the result of choice.

Miley makes the point that theologians who locate depravity in the will treat the will as a person, and not simply an instrumental faculty of the mind, which completes its power of personal action. "There is no impulse or inclination in the will itself. All impulse and inclination are from the sensibilities. The motives of action which arise through the sensibilities address their solicitations to the personal agent, and it is not for his will, but for himself in the use of his will, to refuse or accept these solicitations" (p. 443).

"The willing power is deeply involved in the depravity of our nature, but rather through the perversion of the sensibilities and the moral nature than by any direct effect upon the will itself" (Ibid, p. 443).

The sensuous nature (using the word sensuous in its most general sense, including the sensibilities of body and mind) is most affected by the fall. The feelings, in a healthful state of the sensuous nature, are subordinate to prudence and reason, and may perform their proper functions in harmony with a truly spiritual life. But depravity, brought on by the fall, is "A DISORDERED STATE OF THE SENSUOUS NATURE, WITH THE RESULT OF INORDINATE SENSIBILITIES. Thus arise evil tendencies and vicious impulses and appetencies, inordinate forms of feeling,-all that may be included in "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life." There are many instances of such perverted and inordinate sensibilities, as indicate a disordered state of the sensuous nature. Such disordered state is a part of the depravity of human nature." Added to this is the disordered condition of the conscience and moral reason, so that the moral nature is darkened or perverted. The perception of duty is dim, the conscience is voiceless or ineffective. The vision of God is clouded and uncertain. He seems far away and unreal, and His effective power in the life is lost. The intuitions perceive Him necessarily; but He is no longer powerfully felt as a living presence in the moral consciousness.

"In such a state the soul is morally weak, the sensibilities are selfish and secular in impulse and tendency; and without proper moral restraint they easily run to excess and dominate the life" (Miley, p. 444). THIS IS SIN, THE YIELDING TO THE SENSIBILITIES INSTEAD OF OBEYING THE DICTATES OF RIGHT REASON. So it is that depravity, easily leads human lives into sin and brings them all into condemnation before God.

We can see, then, the effect of the fall. Adam and Eve sinned. Their own spiritual death followed-the deprivation of the peculiar sustaining presence of the Holy Spirit, and the consequent depravation of their sensuous nature and the darkening and weakening of their moral nature. This state was transmitted by the law of heredity to their descendants.

It might be asked-Did the fall of our first parents necessarily constitute all men sinners? To be critically exact, we must answer, No. As a Baptist theologian, Dr. Sheldon, says in his "Sin and Redemption," page 105: "I designedly guard against the view, that the sin of Adam has an immediate causal and determining influence on the sin of his posterity, that his sin directly makes them sinners. All men who sin make themselves sinners. Sin is always a personal and voluntary matter. Outward influences may contribute to lead men into sin; but they can only do this by gaining the consent of the men themselves. Adam had no absolute power to make a sinner of any human being beyond himself. He may have contributed by his example and influence to gain the consent of others to sin; but since, to use the words of Dr. Emmons, all (actual) sin consists in sinning, and hence implies a personal responsible sinner, a free moral agent acting for himself and on his own account, it is plainly in the power of no man whatever to create (voluntary) sin in another mind; just because no man has control of the volitions of another mind. What we say here is not only the spontaneous dictate of our reason; but it is the general current teaching of Scripture, implied in every warning against sin; 'if sinners entice thee, consent thou not'."

President Fairchild says: "The fall of man does not imply that men are born sinners. Such an idea is contrary to our reason and impossible. Sin cannot be a matter of nature, but of responsible, voluntary action. Human nature is not sinful as a nature; it is temptable and weak, liable to fall. A sinful nature in the sense of a blameworthy nature, that which brings the soul under the condemnation of God, is inconceivable and impossible. The idea involves a confusion of nature and character which should be held as utterly distinct. The passages of Scripture supposed to prove the doctrine that men are sinners by birth, are doubtless misinterpreted. Psalms 51: 5, "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me," is an intense, poetical expression of utter sinfulness; and it is poor interpretation to employ it in the sense of a theological dogma. Psalm 58: 3, "The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies." This is a similar expression of the utter perverseness of abandoned men. Eph. 2: 3, "Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were by nature, the children of wrath, even as others." It is not necessary to make the passage involve an absurdity; and we are permitted to interpret the phrase by nature, with proper regard to what is reasonable and possible (Theology, pp. 157, 158).

President Finney, also, says: "The Bible once, and only once, incidentally intimates that Adam's sin has in some way been the OCCASION, not the necessary physical cause, of all the sins of men. (Rom. 5: 12-19). It neither says nor intimates anything in relation to the manner in which Adam's sin has occasioned this result. It only incidentally recognizes the fact, and then leaves it, just as if the quo modo was too obvious to need explanation (Theology, p. 253).

Like President Fairchild, while not denying the depravity of man's entire nature, he objects to the phrase "sinful nature" in the sense of "blame-worthy nature, that which brings the soul under the condemnation of God." He quotes the shorter catechism, "Wherein consists the sinfulness of that estate whereinto man fell? Answer. The Sinfulness of that estate whereinto man fell, consisteth in the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of that righteousness wherein he was created, and the corruption of his nature, whereby he is utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite unto all that is spiritually good, and wholly inclined to all evil, and that continually, and from which do proceed all actual transgressions. Original sin is conveyed from our first parents unto their posterity by natural generation, so as all that proceed from them in that way, are conceived and born in sin." He comments thus: "These extracts show, that the framers and defenders of this confession of faith account for the moral depravity of mankind by making it to consist in a sinful nature, renders mankind utterly disabled from all that is spiritually good, and wholly inclined to all that is evil" (pp. 240,241). Eph. 2:3, "By nature, children of wrath." I remark upon this text that it cannot consistently with natural justice, be understood to mean, that we are exposed to the wrath of God on account of our nature. It is a monstrous and blasphemous dogma, that a holy God is angry with any creature for possessing a NATURE with which he was sent into being without his knowledge or consent. The Bible represents God as angry with men for their wicked deeds, and not for their NATURE. We speak of sinners before regeneration as in a state of nature. We do not necessarily mean that they have a nature sinful in itself, but merely that before regeneration they are universally and morally depraved, that this is their natural as opposed to their regenerate state. Total moral depravity is the state that follows and results from their first birth and is in this sense natural, and in this sense alone, can it be truly said, that they are by nature 'children of wrath.' But the Scriptures teach that men are to be punished only for their deeds"

Finney found that this doctrine of "a sinful nature" was the stronghold of universalism, and of the Calvinistic doctrines of MORAL INABILITY and IRRESISTIBLE grace. "Universalists, assuming the doctrine of original constitutional sinfulness, they proceed to show that it would be infinitely unreasonable and unjust in God to send them to hell. What! Create them with a sinful nature, from which proceed, by law of necessity, actual transgressions, and then send them to an eternal hell, for having this nature, and for transgressions that are unavoidable! "Impossible!" say they, and the human intellect responds, Amen.

From the doctrine of a sinful nature, irresistibly flowed the doctrine of inability to repent, and the necessity of a physical regeneration. They infer the salvation of all men from God's benevolence and physical omnipotence. Men are constitutionally depraved, and are unable to repent. God will not, cannot send them to hell. They do not deserve it. Sin is a calamity, and God can save them, and he ought to do so. This is the substance of their argument, and assuming the truth of their premises, there is no evading their conclusions" (p. 252).

The Calvinists have reasoned thus: Man has a sinful nature as a result of the fall. It makes him wholly unable to do anything to please God. He is wholly unable to repent or believe. Out of this universal mass of moral impotents, God sovereignly and arbitrarily elects a few; upon these God, in His own good time, sends an "irresistible and efficacious grace, inducing repentance and faith." All these are inevitably and "infallibly saved"; all the rest are "infallibly damned," for inheriting a sinful nature from Adam, which they could not help! We may well say, the improbability of the truth of such a doctrine is infinite.

The most common Greek word for sin is hamartia. The first three definitions of it in the Lexicon before us are, "error, offence, sin." Of course these define actual sins for which we are directly responsible. The next three definitions are, "a principle or cause of sin; proneness to sin; sinful propensity." This means the inherited derangement or abnormality of nature, the sad result of the fall, and covered by the word depravity. For this we are not responsible or blameworthy, or guilty. It is our misfortune and not our fault. God does not blame us for it, but pities us, and, as a compensation for this abnormal condition of nature, with its weakness and temptableness and propensity to sin, He graciously gives us all the helps of His redemption. This is the real Gospel of the Son of God.

We will now summarize the effects of the fall.

1. Our first parents lost their primitive holiness, their peculiarly helpful and sustaining presence of the Holy Spirit; and the depravation of their entire physical and mental and moral nature, ensued.
2. When Adam propagated children he gave them just what he had to give, a depraved and fallen nature, weak, temptable, abnormal, deranged, liable to sin, and doomed to face death.
3. Men are born with a nature full of propensities to sin, which lead them universally to commit sin; but they are not born sinners. They make themselves sinners by their own wicked choices.

4. Men are not born with a sinful nature, in the sense of a blameworthy nature, deserving of divine punishment. But they are born full of the "principle of sin, proneness to sin, sinful propensity," which leads all men to commit sin and become sinners. It is called sin, often "the sin" in the New Testament -Greek. For this God does not condemn us, but gives us His infinite pity and helping grace.

* * * * *

CHAPTER VIII -- PROOFS OF NATIVE DEPRAVITY

"The Orthodox Creeds of Christendom uniformly note an inclination to evil or to sin as a characteristic fact of native depravity. Man as fallen and corrupt is of HIS OWN NATURE INCLINED TO EVIL AND THAT CONTINUALLY" (Miley).

"The corruption of human nature means its tendency to sin" (Chalmers). "Original sin is an inclination born with us; an impulse which is agreeable to us; a certain influence which leads us into the commission of sin" (Melanchthon).

Miley, however, decides that this inclination to evil is the result of depravity, not its constitutive fact. Depravity itself lies deeper; the tendency to evil is a mode of its activity (Vol. I, p. 445).

What are the proofs of this depravity?

1. The Scriptures abound in assertions of the universal wickedness of the human heart. "God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually (Gen. 6:*5). "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth" (Gen. 8: 21). "All we like sheep have gone astray" (Isaiah S3: 6). "They have all turned aside. There is none righteous" (Rom. 3: 10-18). A corrupt heart as a universal fact, a race-wide straying from God, a persistent, continual wickedness can only be explained in one way-a race-wide inheritance of depravity, just as the Scripture asserts.

2. We are told that, "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God"; "Therefore by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight" (Rom. 3: 9 and 20). Now the law of God only requires obedience and righteousness. This is equivalent, then, to a declaration that the whole race has come short of being what God had a right to expect of it, and all have sinned. "The man that doeth the righteousness which is of the law, shall live thereby" (Rom. 10: S). But nobody can be justified by the law, because none have kept it. Now such a universality of moral defection and shortcoming can only be accounted for by some racial difficulty that lies deep at the fountain of moral action. We do not, as some do, affirm the impossibility of obedience to the moral law. We do not declare that all men could not obey God; we only say that all men have not obeyed God. There must be a universal reason for universal sinfulness. The reason does not lie in the fault of God's original creation of the race, nor in the injustice of a too exacting law. The difficulty, then, must lie in the lapsed condition of the race.

3. There is the universal necessity of regeneration. Regeneration is an inward renewal of the spiritual nature. The ground of this necessity lies in a native quality, of our nature. "That which is

born of flesh is flesh, and that which is born of spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto you, Ye must be born again" (John 3: 3-7). The word "flesh" cannot here refer to the physical body. "Such a sense could neither express the necessity for, spiritual regeneration, nor allow its possibility. The Scriptures draw a contrast between the flesh and Spirit, or the fleshly mind and the spiritual mind, and between the works of the flesh and the works of the Spirit. We thus have the sense of flesh as our Lord used the term in His doctrine of regeneration. It must mean a depraved state, a corrupt nature" (Miley, Vol. I, pp. 450, 451).

It will be seen from the above that this question of depravity is no trifling side-issue. It is fundamental to all the great doctrines of salvation-atonement, justification, regeneration and sanctification. Native depravity is the presupposition of all. If these doctrines are true, the fallen state of man must be a truth. John Fletcher well asks, "If he is not a depraved, undone creature, what necessity for so wonderful a Restorer and Savior as the Son of God? If he is not enslaved to sin, why must he be redeemed by Jesus Christ? If he is not polluted, why must he be washed in the blood of the immaculate Lamb? If his soul is not disordered, what occasion is there for such a divine Physician? If he is not helpless and miserable, why is he personally invited to secure the assistance and consolations of the Holy Spirit? And, in a word, if he is not "born In sin," why is a "new birth" so absolutely necessary, that Christ declares, with the most solemn assentations. "Without it, no man can see the kingdom of God?" "

4. As we have already seen, there is the universality of actual sin. No race, no tribe, no family of men have ever appeared in any generation of the world's history, who have not been sinful. All languages and literatures and religions bear witness to the mournful fact of abounding sin. No adventurous traveler like Speke, or Grant, or Livingstone, or Stanley, ever discovered one small community of men in any land who were not burdened with a sense of sin. No bold voyager on unknown seas ever landed on one little island whose inhabitants were not vainly trying to propitiate offended deities, and make their peace with the unknown God. If the consciousness of man may be permitted to bear witness, a sinless man has not appeared.

Such a universality of experience points to a common cause. The race has fallen and the stream of moral life was poisoned at its fountain.

Man is a totally depraved being. By this we do not mean: 1. That every man is as bad as he can be; or, 2. That there is no good in any man; or, 3. That all are equally sinful; or, 4. That each is given to the commission of all sins; or, 5. That there have not been, or are not, good men. We simply mean that the whole man (*totus homo*) has been injured in every department and faculty of his being, and is not now what he would have been, but for the fall. As a result, no man claims to have led a sinless life. The truest and best look back with regret upon many things in their past. No man, known or unknown could claim that his entire life had been sinless, without offending the common moral judgment of man, and by the very assertion, proving himself to be sinful. And such a judgment is based on the known and admitted universality of human sinfulness. "If we say we have not sinned we make him a liar, and his word is not in us" (1 John 1: 10).

5. There is a universal tendency to sin. Tendency is proved by the observation of continuous and uniform results. The constancy of events or conduct or actions prove a tendency. A million ducks of whatever variety, hatched in whatever land, will all take to water as soon as they see it. It

proves a tendency. Beech trees growing in whatever land or soil will produce beechnuts. So the uniformity of human sinfulness, and the ease with which children everywhere and always commit sin, even against their own sense of duty and the protests of their conscience, proves to a demonstration, a tendency to sin. There is in the human family a uniformity in sinful action. With all the differences of race and temperament and environment, and social condition, and education and religious training, there is this uniformity of moral action. This universality of sin proves an evil tendency in human nature. It is scientific evidence of an abnormal condition of man's moral nature, called in the language of the world DEPRAVITY.

Those who deny this depravity of nature try to account for this universal sinfulness;

1. On the ground of bad example and education, but the bad example and bad education must themselves be universal to produce universal sin. And where did this universal bad example come from, and how came there to be a universal bad education? Logically, these are only evidences of the universal depravity, and forms of the universal sinfulness. It is absurd to make a thing account for itself; and still worse to make a part of a thing account for the whole. And, further, how came the bad example to be so willingly and universally followed, if there were not some equally universal susceptibilities to temptation with an accompanying propensity to sin? This only could account for a universal yielding to bad influence. But if there are universally deranged sensibilities with a bias toward evil, then depravity, the thing objected to, is proved to a demonstration.

2. People have tried to show that the simple possession of free-will is adequate to explain all actual sin, without depravity. It is true that a third part of the angels by the abuse of their free-wills sinned and fell, though they were previously holy, and free from depravity. We have explained how holy beings have fallen and can fall. So our first parents yielded to temptation when as yet they were not depraved. We answer, with regard to the angels that they did not all sin, as all our race have done. As to Adam we can say that a single act may be performed that is out of harmony with the life, and is not induced by a natural tendency in that direction. But to account for a habit of life in all the innumerable beings of the race, we do require an inward universal tendency or disposition. A single act of sin of one man does not explain why the continuous multiplied acts of billions of men should be sinful. "Native depravity is the only rational account of universal sin, and its reality is thus proved" (Edwards and Miley).

"So far as the race-connection works to the extension of evil through transmission and social influences, it is the nature of this process to continue indefinitely, in proportion to the strength of the evil. It is destined to last as long as the evil lasts; it can be stopped only by influences that renovate the race, and turn its powers to better use. Sin has in itself no tendency to return upward; it is essentially a moral gravitation, drawing ever downward.

"What the race connection perpetuates is depravity, or corruption of the common stock of mankind. The human nature that is passed from generation to generation always possesses in itself the elements of the old strife between the higher and the lower. It is also depraved, or "baddened," as the word simply means; that is, it is so affected by previous evil in the race as to have predispositions to the wrong. Depravity is the moral badness that has been, imparted to that common stream of life out of which successive individuals are produced. It is corruption of the common stock, perpetuated through heredity and the influence of life. In consequence of this

perverted strain in the transmitted humanity, children are; not born either wholly good, or neutral between good and evil, but with evil tendencies which grow into sin when responsible life begins. This corruption appears in various degrees, but experience finds it everywhere, and confirms the testimony of Scriptures that; all have sinned. The early appearance in personal lives of the fundamental moral evil, grasping self-will, gives evidence of the predisposition to it that dwells in the common nature.

"The corruption of the human stock which is transmitted by race-connection, must be carefully distinguished from guilt. Guilt can be neither transmitted nor transferred. Guilt is necessarily personal, the sinner's own. It is the result of sinning, and can belong to no one but the one who has sinned. It is impossible for one to be guilty of another's sin, unless the other's sin leads him to sin also. Hence there is no such thing as inheriting guilt before God from the first sinner, or from any other ancestor. Heredity conveys depravity down the stream of life, but not guilt, for sins already committed. Sin cannot be imputed to a sinner's offspring. If then could be imputation of guilt at all it should move in the other direction" (toward Adam instead of toward his offspring). (Dr W. N. Clarke, D. D., "Christian Theology," pp. 243, 244.):

"Guilt is the personal blameworthiness that follows the commission of sin. It consists in the fact that the person in question is the one who has done the deed, and upon whom the blame rests and must rest. Such is the guilt, for example, of murder; The guilt consists in the fact that the man, wherever he is and whatever he is doing, sleeping or waking, working or playing, following his pursuits or kissing his innocent children, is the man who has murdered another, and upon whom the responsibility and wickedness of the act abide. Sleeping, or waking, working, playing or praying, living or dying and waking in another world, he is the man who has done the sinful thing and is justly to be blamed for; doing it. Herein lies his guilt. Liability to punishment is a consequence of guilt, but not guilt itself. It cannot be prevented from following sin, nor annihilated by any act of the sinner after it has come; **NOR CAN IT BE TRANSFERRED TO ANY OTHER BEING WHATSOEVER.** Its nature is to abide forever, upon the one who has committed sin" (Ibid, pp. 246-248). This Baptist Theological professor of Colgate University, voices the best Christian thought of the day on this subject. 1. "The stream of human life" was poisoned at its fountain. 2. This "moral badness" or "corruption of the common stock" is perpetuated by race-connection, and leads all to commit sin. 3. Sin has no tendency to correct itself. 4. Sin produces guilt. 5. Guilt cannot be transferred or imputed to anyone else. The sinner himself must bear it. This is the teaching of Scripture, the voice of reason, the verdict of conscience. "If thou art wise, thou art wise for thyself; and if thou scoffest, thou alone shalt bear it" (Prov. 9: 12). "The soul that sinneth it shall die; the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him" (Ezek. 18: 20).

3. It is objected that there are many natural virtues, and many good men even among those who did not have the light of revelation. We have admitted the possibility of this, even with depravity. These natural virtues, not connected with regeneration, have appeared in all nations and all walks of life. All along the centuries men have lived whose lives were an ornament to the race, whose virtues were conspicuous, whose purity, and integrity and uprightness were above reproach. Some were gentle and lovable, full of sympathy and kindness; others had the strong heroic virtues that would sacrifice and suffer for the public good. We have no interest whatever in detracting from the

honor and worth of such men. They have been called by a great writer "the outside saints." A doctrine of depravity, however, that would not leave room for such possible results, would be untrue to fact and to life. Human life is not made by depravity totally and irredeemably bad. But those who offer this objection to the doctrine of depravity overlook the following facts:

(1) That all these noble souls had a perpetual struggle with internal propensities. Their goodness was no accident. Socrates confessed that he would have been grossly vile but for the influence of philosophy upon his life;

(2) That the race has not been left by God to all the evil effects of depravity, unaided. The unconditional benefits of the atonement have come to all and "the true light that lighteth every man, coming into the world," has blessed all lives.

(3) That God has by his restraining providences, held the evil tendencies of men in check and kept depravity from having full expression.

(4) God has raised up men in all nations and ages to disseminate moral and religious influences which were calculated to create a counteracting force against the evil tendencies of human hearts.

(5) A spontaneous good conduct, the result of fortunate environment, and happy birth, may exist, without any exalted sense of God or duty, and have the outward seeming of virtues without being virtues at all. As Miley says: "These natural virtues may exist, not only in the absence of a true spiritual life, but with aversion to such a life, with propensity to evil, and with actual evil, and give no proof against the doctrine of native depravity" (Vol. I, p. 457).

6. Another line of evidence that the race is somehow estranged from God and in an abnormal state, is the universality of death. "Wherefore, as by one man THE SIN principle entered into the world and the death through THE SIN: and so death passed upon all men for that all have sinned" (Rom. 5: 12). This is the literal translation. We call attention to the striking fact that the Greek noun for sin "Hamartia" is found thirty-six times between Romans 5: 12 and Roman 8: 10, and in twenty-nine of these times it has the definite article "the" before it, and always in the singular number. We suspected that it meant a particular kind of sin-namely, depravity, or the sin-principle. In several of the seven other times, it means actual sin. The best commentators confirmed our opinion. DR. WHEDON says: "By the sin many understand the state of sin into which man has fallen as a nature. Sin is not in action alone; there may be a permanently wrong and wicked state of mind. DEAN ALFORD says: "The kind of sin spoken of in this whole passage is both original and actual." GODET says: "The principle of revolt, the corrupt inward disposition, is what the Apostle is speaking of. Lange says: "The definite article before 'hamartia' and 'thanatos' denotes sin and death as a power or principle, which controls man and reveals itself in hereditary corruption and every actual sin." Augustine and Calvin make it mean "native depravity." Koppe, Olshausen, Webster, and Wilkinson say it means "sinfulness; sinfulness personified, a sinful disposition." With such endorsement we are sure of our footing. "The sin" means "the sin principle"; that brought to our race the death principle.

Theologians have argued that if "all" sinned and so died, then the babies who died during past ages must have sinned; therefore they either sinned in Adam, or his sin was imputed to them. But there is

no need of any such forced and unnatural not to say absurd, argument. St. Paul was simply using language in a popular way, as we all do, and little children died, not because they had sinned in some fanciful, imaginary way before they were born, but because they were born with the sin-principle and therefore, also, with the death-principle in them.

But to match this awful misfortune God gave us the grace of an atoning Savior, and if we became depraved and sinful and doomed to death through Adam, we also have the "much more" salvation of justification and sanctification, and resurrection from the dead through Christ.

7. Another evidence of the depravity of the race is the slow progress of Gospel agencies. Granted that the ministry is trusting too much to natural resources of their education, mental powers, social gifts and oratory, and that the churches are relying upon ecclesiastical power and numbers and wealth and machinery, instead of pastors and churches alike leaning upon the power of the Holy Ghost, yet all these admissions fall short of explaining the feebleness of Gospel efforts, and the meager triumphs of the kingdom of God. There is a dead inertia of public sentiment, a stolid indifference to Gospel warnings and appeals, a persistent, open-eyed, conscious resistance to truth and God which can only be explained by the speedy operation of some power in the soul that is hostile to goodness and God. The fruitage of Gospel effort has been small because the nature of man has strongly resisted every uplifting influence. God is everywhere graciously present, with men, moving upon the citadel of the heart with precepts and promises, with warnings against sin, with punishments of evil, and blessings for obedience. But the evil tendencies of men have held out against every restraining and gracious influence of God. They go on in sin, rejecting mercy and grace, refusing to have the fear of God before their eyes, until they provoke the retribution of divine wrath. Even the holy apostles and Jesus Himself could not woo men in accents gentle and tender enough to overmatch this internal resistance and win everyone to abandon sin and accept Christ and His salvation.

Even self-interest, that potent force in every life, which is so effective in every other field of influence, fails here. Men go on in pursuit of evil, deaf to all appeals, blind to the certain consequences of wickedness, in an apathy of moral indifference which must be an amazement to sympathetic angels, and the grief of a loving God. There is but one rational explanation-universal depravity.

A theological student of mine sat in a great audience and heard Bishop M-- of the M. E. Church lecture. In the course of his address he said: "There is nothing but good in the human heart; wars are merely incidental and spring from secondary causes." He illustrated this universal human goodness by the Chicago fire, telling of the wonderful assistance that was rendered the inhabitants of the stricken city in the way of provisions and money by the outside world.

Shame on such cheap playing to the galleries for popularity from such a quarter, regardless of ordination vows and denominational theology, and the Holy Word. The orator should have gone on and told a little more about that same Chicago; that "there were eight hundred homicides and murders in the city in a little over two years, while the profits on the houses of shame (not the income) was sixteen million dollars annually, and the gifts of the whole city to Christian work was but four millions a year!" Big ecclesiastics may flatter fashionable worldliness, and say with a silly leer that "there is nothing but good in the human heart"; but we need no Bible to prove the

often appeal to human reason on this very question? Every such an appeal is an admission that men do know what right or equity is; what it demands and what it forbids. If not, then there is an end not only to all reasoning and conclusion in theology, but to all confidence in God. If there be no standard of right or equity on which human reason is competent to decide, where is our proof of His justice or goodness? How can we reason or judge at all in respect to either His character or His government? But if there is such a standard, if there is an eternal rule of right which human reason does and must judge, or be of no use to man, then the appeal is fairly made to human reason. I ask, then, what violation of the eternal rule of right more palpable, than to transfer the guilt of one being to another; than to count another guilty, and to punish Him as guilty for another's acts? Admit that such a principle obtains in the moral administration of God, and what are the consequences? He who is not guilty becomes truly guilty; yea, he who is holy, may be really and at the same time as guilty as the guiltiest, and be treated accordingly. Such a principle subverts everything; law, equity, moral government, moral character, in respect to both God and man are overthrown, and the righteous as well as the wicked have cause for consternation and dismay.

Again; this doctrine derives no support from Scriptures. Allowing the possibility that it should be found in the Bible, still no passage can be properly understood to teach it which will admit of any other meaning. Before a doctrine so revolting to reason and common sense can be palmed upon the Word of God, it must be shown that the language cannot be interpreted in any other but the absurd meaning, and this I affirm to be impossible in respect to any passage cited to support it" (Revealed Theology, pp. 246-248).

III. Men who have rejected this theory of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, and yet hold that native depravity is a judicial infliction, and deserving of eternal punishment have resorted to the theory of "sin in a pre-existent life." They have held that the only valid ground of guilt and punishment must lie in a free, personal violation of duty in a previous state of existence. This doctrine was common in Grecian philosophy. Origen in the Third Century taught it. It was advocated by Dr. Edward Beecher, in his "Conflict of Ages." Julius Muller maintained it for the reason above stated that only free personal sinning can justify the sinful state in which he believed all men were born. And there could be no place for such sinning except in a pre-existent state.

The theory is a pure speculation, and quite out of harmony with the Bible doctrine of primitive holiness and the fall. The Bible clearly teaches that there is no self-recovery of sinners and that our first parents began their probation in negative holiness. When and where and how did they get their moral recovery? Scriptures teach that the depravity is the result of the fall. There is no relief in this untenable theory.

IV. THE REALISTIC MODE OF ADAMIC SIN. This theory holds the doctrine of the Imputation of Adam's first sin to all his posterity on the ground of A CONSTITUTED PERSONAL IDENTITY of Adam and his posterity, as follows: God in creating man, created not merely Adam, but mankind, human nature, Adam and his posterity, as one moral whole, one moral person, determining this oneness or identity by His sovereign constitution. The human race, man as thus created and constituted one moral person, was created morally upright, so that, as God's work, what Adam was as created, his posterity were also as created. The first sin of Adam was thus the sin which Adam committed both in number and in kind, and on the only equitable principle of imputing sin to any being, it was imputed to Adam and to his posterity-to Adam because he

committed it, ' and to them because they committed it. Thus the original sin Of Adam's posterity is the sin which each of them, as one moral person with Adam, being like him created upright, committed, and as truly as Adam committed his original sin, and being then committed by each just as it was by Adam, it was imputed to each just as it was imputed to him. It was the act, the sin of each, the fall of each, the apostasy and fall of all his posterity, just as it was of Adam himself. It is this sin, with all its corruption and guilt, and with this only, that each of the posterity is born, not created; so that man, each individual of the race, not God, is the author of his own sin.

This, says Dr. N. W. Taylor, is the ancient doctrine of original sin, which first received its definite and permanent form from Augustine early in the fifth century, and then adopted by the scholastic theologians and reformers, and defended by Jonathan Edwards.

Augustine said: "We were all in that one man, since we were all that one man who fell into sin. In Adam all have sinned, as all were that one man. Infants belong to human nature and are guilty of original sin because human nature sinned in our first parents. All sinned in Adam; the human race were in the loins of Adam. Infants derive from him the guilt of sin and the punishment of death" (Taylor's Theology, pp. 169, 170).

Calvin said: "We all sinned before we were born and when born we have the corruption which each contracted in the sin of Eden, and therefore infants themselves, as they bring their condemnation into the world with them, are rendered obnoxious to punishment by their own sinfulness, not by the sinfulness of another" (Ibid, p. 172).

Let us say to the honor of Calvin that these views from his Institutes, B. II, p. 299, which were written in early life, were repudiated in his Commentary on Rom. 5: 12 written in his maturer age, in which he expressly affirms that the apostle had no thought of infants. "We may well admire the greatness and candor of Calvin," says Taylor, especially in changing his opinions on this subject, and on that of limited Atonement, after he had acquired a high theological reputation by his Institutes." It is only a rare lover of truth who can thus outgrow his own published errors.

Dr. Taylor says of this strange theory: "That Adam and his posterity are one moral person, or one moral being, and that the latter committed the selfsame sin which Adam committed while as yet they were not in existence is not a possible truth. It involves the palpable contradiction that beings who are not the same being, are the same being; that those who did not exist and act, did exist and act.

"The doctrine of a created or constitutional propensity to sin, which is itself sinful (in the sense of blameworthy) is also fraught with self-contradiction. We know what sin is and what it is not. We know that sin (as blameworthy) can no more pertain to the created properties or constitutional propensities of the mind, than to the features of the face, or the form and structure of the human body. To say therefore that a constitutional propensity of the soul is sinful, is as absurd and self-contradictory as to say that the soul is solid and extended, or that matter thinks and wills; it is saying that that is sinful which is not and cannot be sinful" (pp. 219, 220). "The doctrine then, that infants are sinners at the precise instant: of existence, in every conceivable form of it, is self-contradictory- cannot be true and therefore is not taught in the Word of God.

This interpretation of Scripture, which we oppose, contravenes common sense. This doctrine is a theological peculiarity. It was unknown in the early Christian Church; was derived from the philosophic doctrine of Realism in the Fourth Century; was devised to carry a point in polemic theology, and has, therefore, no other or higher authority than a speculation of heathen philosophy" (pp. 220-222). "But not to dwell on such absurdities, what shall be said of a moral government in which such a principle is acted upon, and what of its author? The mind unperverted by theological system cannot fail to see what appalling consequences must follow the adoption of the principle, that one being is to be considered and treated as having acted in another's act; nor indeed that God himself cannot make it true that one being is another, or the act of one is the act of the other. No constitution or covenant of God can make it true that a being can sin before he exists. All that can be said in extenuation of these FOOLERIES is that great and good men, may believe the most palpable absurdities without seeing them to be such, when they suppose themselves obliged to adopt them in defense of revealed truth" (p. 250).

We do not wonder that this theologian calls such doctrines "fooleries." If there had been a billion of souls in every drop of Adam's blood, he would not have had blood enough to hold the human race. "We sinned in Adam before we were born!" How? Actual sin is a matter of wicked choice. When Adam chose to eat the forbidden fruit did countless billions of us choose to eat at the same instant? And when he was rejoicing in his delicious but sinful repast, did we all smack our infinitesimal lips and say it tasted good? We remember when Dr. Timothy Dwight, the beloved, of Yale, was discussing this doctrine before our class, how, with both! elbows on his desk and stroking his bald head with his hands, he; declared: "I was not in Adam's jacket-pocket, and I declare that; I had nothing to do with his sin." But is not this making light of the opinions of very great men, Augustine, Calvin and Edwards? Certainly it is. But very great men were only men; and they often lost their common sense in their speculations. A noble Doctor of Divinity has written: "It takes a great man to make a great fool of himself." It is a true proverb that "everybody knows more than anybody."

President Fairchild disposed of this theory in six lines: "Nor is there occasion to accept the idea that we were in Adam, in a natural, realistic, sense; that he embodied in himself all the human race, and that all humanity acted responsibly in him. It is claimed that this is the realistic theory of Augustine; but whatever its source, it is a mere speculation without proof in Scripture or in reason" (Theology, p. 159).

Dr. Shedd of Union Theological Seminary, New York, adopted and developed Augustine's Realism. He quoted from Augustine and added: "These passages which might be multiplied indefinitely, are sufficient to indicate Augustine's theory of generic existence, generic transgression, and generic condemnation. The substance of the theory is-human nature apostatizes and the consequences appear in human individuals. In the order of nature mankind exists before the generations of mankind; the nature is prior to the individuals produced out of it" (History of Christian Doctrine, Vol. II, pp. 77, 78). This theory divides into two:

- 1st. Individuals have no separate being but are mere modes of generic nature. It is pantheistic.

2nd. Each individual has the essence of existence, which was previously in the generic nature, and is derived from it in a process of individuation, whereby individuals receive their separate existence.

Miley affirms that the first theory is "too senseless for any acceptance in rational thought." Each man, as a responsible person, must possess in himself the reality of individual existence. Each man's consciousness absolutely affirms such an existence (Vol. I, p. 475).

Miley says of the second: "It could not be thought that the substance of all human bodies in its phenomenal and bulk form existed in Adam." The existence of the race in a metaphysical form is a pure assumption. Generic human nature could not commit the primitive sin. There must be personal faculties for moral action (p. 476). He shows that all the Augustinian, Calvinistic writers aim to teach two things: 1, The fall of the human race as a unity; 2, and at the same time recognize the existence, freedom, and guilt ' of the individual in the fall (p. 478). He objects:

1. It is a pure assumption that there is any generic human nature apart from individual men.
2. The individuation of the generic nature into the individuals of the race is impossible, because a personality that could sin is indivisible. A spiritual essence cannot be so divided.
3. The theory would make us share not the first sin of Adam alone, but the second sin, and all his sins; and not the sin of one ancestor alone, but of all our ancestors, for we existed as much in each ancestor as in the first. According to the philosophy of realism there is no getting away from it. The sins of all ancestors would be upon us at birth-truly a horrible way to be born.
4. Generic nature, simply as such, could not sin.
5. The division and distribution of a spiritual essence, considered simply as an essence into the innumerable personalities of the race transcends the utmost reach of human philosophy. The notion of such a division and distribution of such an essence, already existing in personality and active in personal agency, is utterly aberrant from all rational thinking upon such a question. Free personal agency is necessary to the commission of sin, and the participation of all men in the sin of Adam was consequently impossible. o

V. A LOWER FORM OF REALISM.

This teaches the germinal or seminal existence of the race in Adam. The aim is the same as in the Higher Realism, viz., to identify the offspring of Adam in some mysterious way with himself, and make them guilty with him in his sin. But the illustrations and arguments utterly fall short of proof. The primitive sin was an act of free personal agency, and could not else have been a sin. That agency was wholly in Adam. We had no such existence in him as made us sharers in his personal act, or in the guilt of his sin. Personal agency is necessary to sinful action. All attempts fail to prove that the assumed germinal entities, if really existent in Adam, had any personal existence in him. The whole argument starts with the assumption of the rudimentary existence of all men in Adam, souls as well as bodies. A premise so exceedingly doubtful can be the basis of no conclusive argument. Calvin rejected it; Augustine was in serious doubt of it, and most of the

Reformed theologians agree with them. To this day theologians of all schools are divided between CREATIONISM, which holds that souls are created separately along with the process of propagation; and Traducianism, which holds that all souls were created in Adam.

The unanswerable objections to the theory are that: 1. It implies seminal guilt. There can be NO SUBJECT OF GUILT BELOW PERSONALITY. "The notion that souls existing only seminally in Adam, could be guilty of sin and subjects of divine wrath is too preposterous for the utmost credulity." 2. Like the Higher Realism, it would make us guilty of all ancestral sins. 3. If we shared Adam's sins, we should also share his repentance and his pardon. Why then should native depravity be inflicted as a penalty, when the sin, the ground of its infliction, was removed before the propagation of the race? The truth is, any form of realism is untenable, and breaks down utterly at the bar of reason.

VI. THE REPRESENTATIVE MODE OF ADAMIC GUILT.

In the Realistic theory all men are held to have participated in the commission of the primitive sin. In the Representative theory, there was no actual participation in that sin, but only a sharing in its guilt by imputation.

The theory is that God instituted a covenant with Adam whereby he was constituted the federal head and legal representative of the race in the primitive probation. This so-called Federal Headship constituted not an actual oneness of the race with Adam, but a legal oneness; so that the legal consequences of his conduct under probation, whether good or bad, should be attributed to them.

The abettors of this theory illustrate by acts of attainder when children suffer the evil consequences of a- parent's crime. They cite Achan; but they cannot prove that his family were not privy to the sin and sharers of guilt. They try to prove their theory by Rom. S: 12-19. But all the other rival theories we have named resort to the same passage for confirmation making it extremely probable that it supports none of them.

The objections to the theory are numerous and fatal:

1. After the Federal Headship of Adam is admitted, there is still the question how we are guilty of his sin, and the only answer is that it is by a judicial act of divine imputation. This imputation, so the modern defenders say, brings over to us not the act of Adam nor the demerit of Adam, but only its guilt in the sense of Amenability to punishment. Cunningham says: "Adam was constituted by God the representative and federal head of his posterity, so that his transgression without any injustice to them, becomes theirs, so that they were justly involved in its proper consequences" (History of Theology, Vol. I. pp. 337, 338). Dr. Hodge says: "When it is said that the sin of Adam is imputed to his posterity it is not meant that they committed his sin, nor that they are morally criminal, but simply that, in view of the union between him and them, his sin is the judicial ground of the condemnation of the race" (Hodge's Theology, Vol. II, pp. 192-195). So according to the advocates of this theory themselves, there is: 1. A separation between demerit and guilt; 2. The theory represents our holy God as imputing the sin of the guilty Adam to his innocent descendants, and holding them to be deserving of eternal damnation!

Well did the Arminian Remonstrants affirm against such an atrocious theory: "There is no ground for the assertion, that the sin of Adam was imputed to his posterity in the sense that God actually judged the posterity of Adam to be guilty of, and chargeable with the same sin and crime which Adam had committed. Neither Scripture, nor truth, nor wisdom, nor divine benevolence, nor the nature of sins, nor the idea of justice and equity, allow that they should say that the sin of Adam was thus imputed to his posterity. Scripture testifies that God threatened punishment to Adam alone, and inflicted it upon Adam alone; the Divine benevolence, veracity and wisdom do not permit that one person's sin should be imputed, strictly and literally, to another. It is contrary to the nature of sin, that that should be regarded as sin, and be properly imputed as sin, which was not committed by individual will. It is contrary to justice and equity, that any one should be charged as guilty, for a sin that is not his own, or that he should be judged as really guilty, who in respect to his individual voluntariness is innocent, or, rather, not guilty. And the injustice is the greater, in proportion as the punishment which follows the imputation is severer. Consequently it is the height of injustice, when the penalty is an eternal suffering." Arminius, also, in his defense, wrote: "The Remonstrants decide with confidence that God neither will, nor justly can, destine to eternal torment any infants who die without actual and individual sins, upon the ground of a sin which is called 'original' which is said to be contracted by infants by no individual fault of theirs, but by the fault of another person, and which is believed to be theirs for no other reason than that God wills arbitrarily to impute it to them. This opinion is contrary to divine benevolence, and to right reason; nay it is uncertain which is greater its absurdity or its cruelty" (Shedd's History of Church Doctrine, Vol. II, pp. 183-185).

2. There is or was no such federal or forensic headship, as the representative theory maintains. The word 'federal' is from foedus, meaning a covenant or league. The theory is that God made a covenant or league, with Adam that he should stand for his posterity, and that they should stand or fall in him. Now the term federal headship is not in the Bible, nor anything that teaches that there ever was any such "covenant." If Adam had assumed to; stand for the unborn billions of our race, it would have been a base usurpation of rights which by no possibility could belong to him. And that God should consent to let the fate of billions of immortal' beings be decided by the conduct of one man before they were born, is monstrous and unthinkable. It is simply one of the theological fictions of Calvinism, which should long ago have been relegated to the museum of intellectual and theological curiosities. It greatly annoys us to find the term 'federal headship' used approvingly in Methodist Literature. It never can be a consistent part of Methodist theology-the strongest and best in the world.

3. By such a covenant, the obedience of Adam would have secured to the race, the rewards of eternal life and heaven, without probation and without a struggle. There is no ground in reason, analogy or Scripture for such a position. "It assumes that all men would have been accounted personally righteous by the imputation of the personal righteousness of Adam. This is a most exaggerated notion of the possible effects of Adam's obedience and lifts it into rivalry with the atonement of Christ" (Miley, Vol. I, p. 503).

4. This theory denies the sharing of the race in the act of the demerit of Adam's sin, (while Realism asserts both) but still teaches the justice of the damnation of the race for that sin. Dr. Shedd declared that "the doctrine of a gratuitous damnation was unintelligible and absurd."

We remember Dr. Dwight saying to us in the classroom: "I voted for Hon. -- to be my representative in the lower House at Washington. Suppose now that without my knowledge he should kill a man. Who would say that it would be just for the government to hang me for that crime? But I did not even vote for Adam to represent me, and he committed his sin ages before I was born. How much more unjust in God to condemn me to eternal damnation for Adam's sin. 'But,' some one may say, 'justice in God is not like justice in man.' Very well, if that is so, if justice in God is not essentially like justice in man, let us close our theological books and go about some other business. We are all at sea and do not know what we are talking about."

5. This separation of guilt from demerit, and holding innocent beings responsible for a deed they did not commit, makes the guilt of the race an artificial, arbitrary and fictitious thing, utterly confusing to the moral nature of man. Men can never help questioning the justice of the Divine procedure, if one sin of one man plunges the unborn billions of the race into guilt as great as that the original sinner, and as liable as he to eternal damnation. Millions have revolted, against the doctrine and have remained in religion, or gone off into infidelity, rather than accept it. The doctrine insults the justice of God and the sense of justice which He has implanted in man.

6. It is contrary to the convicting work of the Holy Spirit. None in the Bible and none out of it, are convicted for Adam's sin. No such doctrine can be in the Word of God.

* * * * *

CHAPTER X -- GENETIC LAW OF DEPRAVITY

I. Genetic means pertaining to the genesis of anything. It is the law of organic life that everything produces its own kind. Now we have examined the Calvinistic theories and found them unsustained by either Scripture or reason. They make native depravity a penal retribution and deserving of damnation. Against this view the unperverted reason of man revolts. It does not at all alter the fact of depravity which still remains to be explained in its origin and effect.

1. There is an entirely sufficient account of depravity, in the: simple law of heredity. By the universal law of genetic transmission the corruption of the progenitors of the race is thus transmitted to their offspring. The offspring are a reproduction of the; parentage not only in anatomical structure and physiological constitution, but also in the qualities of instinct and disposition. The old lion likes blood and the young whelp inherits the taste. The meekness and gentleness of the sheep is transmitted to the lamb through all ages. This divinely created law rules over the human family as well as over the brutes.

If Adam had maintained his primitive holiness, his offspring; would have been born in the same state; but subject just as Adam was to a possible lapse. "Any notion of an immediate imputation of Adam's personal righteousness to his offspring as the judicial ground of their birth in subjective holiness is utterly groundless. It must assume that without such imputation, all must have been born in depravity, which at once contradicts the determining law of; heredity, and the holiness and goodness of God. There is no requirement for any other law than that of genetic transmission"; (Miley, Vol. I, p. 506).

2. Sufficiency of this law, This law once instituted by God will work without any special legislation from Him. If Adam had remained holy His children would have been born holy without any divine imputation of Adam's righteousness. As Adam sinned, there was no need of any imputation of sin, and divine infliction of penalty. This self-acting law passed on the corruption of Adam to the posterity with infallible certainty; not as a penalty inflicted upon innocent beings; for imputed sin, but as a natural consequence. So the inherited depravity of every babe is not a penalty for a sin he committed before he was born, but is simply an inherited misfortune.

We have thus at a stroke freed ourselves from three monstrous errors of Calvinism. (1) Imputation of one person's guilt to others; (2) The notion that depravity is a penalty inflicted by God for sin committed before birth; or that still more horrible reflection on the goodness of God, that it is a penalty inflicted on men when perfectly innocent, because of the sin of an imaginary representative; (3) that heathenish notion that all infants at birth are sinners fully deserving eternal damnation! We may well pause here to draw a long breath of satisfaction at an escape from mischievous errors which have perplexed the centuries, by adopting the genetic law of depravity, which is in perfect harmony with universal facts, and also with all the truth involved.

Were it not for the consequences of the law of heredity, there would have been no common depravity needing vindication. Why account the corruption of human nature a punishment when it exists in fullest accord with all the beneficent processes of propagation?

Some may then infer that the children born of holy parents should be holy. This we know is not the case, and we are asked to explain. The truth of a common native depravity forbids the inference that the children of the sanctified will be born in the same high state of grace. Depravity is a matter of race; regeneration or sanctification is a personal work of grace in the individual heart. It is not a matter of original constitution, but a gracious state achieved through the supernatural agency of the Holy Spirit, and is not transmissible through natural generation. There are analogies in the natural world. "The fruit of a graft produces, not its own special quality, but that of the natural stock."

3. This law of genetic depravity must be the true one, for it covers all the facts and is in perfect harmony with Scriptures and the demands of reason. The Psalmist said: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity," etc. This is a poetic description of an inherited native evil, transmitted through natural generation. The same truth was taught by Jesus in explaining the necessity for regeneration. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." "Sarx" in this text stands for depraved human nature; and so here is a distinct declaration that our fallen nature reproduces itself. Therefore there is no need of resorting to the law of penal retribution to explain what is amply accounted for by a well-known law of nature.

The transmission is not a penalty; it is the working out of an original and beneficent law. By the same law good qualities are propagated as well as bad. If the love of art, or music, or literature, or oratory is handed down from generation to generation, if the human race still continues to propagate human beings, with erect form, and God-like faculties instead of propagating brutes, we have no just ground for complaint that the same law reproduces depravity.

II. Doctrine of Native Demerit.

It still remains to consider a doctrine advocated by many, that native depravity, however it was obtained, is in itself intrinsically evil, and deserves punishment. Dr. Charles Hodge taught this and Dr. Shedd. It is involved in the statements of the creeds that are formed on the basis of Augustinian anthropology. The Augsburg Confession: "This disease or original fault, is truly sin, condemning and bringing eternal death." The Belgic Confession: "Original sin is sufficient to condemn all mankind." "In every person born into the world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation" (Articles of Church of England). Our native corruption, doth, in its own nature, bring guilt upon the sinner, whereby he is bound over to the wrath of God, and curse of the law (Westminster Conference).

The proof they bring is that depravity is called sin. We have admitted this in a previous chapter. But that does not prove that "hamartia" always carries with it the sense of demerit. Often this is not the case. "I took your sin, the calf ye made, and burnt it with fire" (Deut. 9: 21). The sin offering is frequently called sin (Ex. 29: 14; 2 Cor. 5: 21). So by metonymy our depravity is called sin because it tends to actual sin, but without demerit, simply as a subjective state (Miley, p. 511). This occurs twenty-nine times between Rom. 5: 12 and Rom. 8: 10. So our depravity, though the fountain of our sinful-ness, may not, in itself have demerit, it certainly does not have in the case of an infant.

For an illustration, it is proper to place in comparison the primitive state of Adam and the fallen state of the race. What he was in respect to holiness we may be in respect to sinfulness. What was the holiness of Adam? Simply a divinely created subjective state free from evil tendencies, and with spontaneous inclination to the good. No credit was due to Adam for having been created so. His holiness possessed no strictly ethical character such as arises and can arise only, from holy obedience to the divine will. **THERE IS BLESSEDNESS IN THIS STATE BUT NO REWARDABLE MERIT**, no worthiness in any proper sense rewardable. Compare this with the fallen state of infants. They come into the world depraved just as Adam came holy. This depravity brings spontaneous aversion to good, and inclination to evil, but no blame is due to them for having been created so. **THERE IS DISCOMFORT AND PERIL IN IT BUT NO DEMERIT OR DAMNABLE SIN**. The infants are no more to blame for being born depraved, than they are to blame for being born with two hands or two feet, or two eyes. Dr. Fisk well says: "The guilt of depravity is not imputed to the subject of it until by intelligent volition he makes the guilt his own, by resisting and rejecting the grace of the gospel" (Calvinistic Controversy, p. 183). Dr. Whedon says: "We hold, on the contrary, that though sinward tendencies exist in germ in the infant, yet there is no responsibility and no damnability, until these tendencies are deliberately acted in real life, and by that action appropriated and sanctioned" (Commentary, Eph. 2:3). In other words, guilt can arise only in connection with responsible personal volition.

But the Calvinists will not have it so. Their argumentative chain has five links: 1. Adam sinned; 2. The guilt of this sin was put upon the race by immediate imputation; 3. The race is punished by God, on the ground of this imputation; 4. The common native depravity is the consequence of that penal infliction; 5. This native depravity is intrinsically sinful and merits damnation. Miley makes this appropriate comment: "We are all absolutely without any personal agency in a single link of this chain. It is not even pretended that we have any. The doctrine is, that the universal amenability to an eternal penal doom arises from the common native depravity passively inherited from Adam. If consistently with Divine justice there can be such native sinfulness, such penal desert of a mere

nature passively received, then the absolute infliction of the deserved punishment upon all the race, and in an eternal penal doom, would be equally consistent with that justice. There can be no injustice in the infliction of deserved penalty. If such are the possibilities respecting the human race, then there must be possible modes wherein the guilt of sin could be spread over the moral universe, and all intelligences without any agency of their own be justly whelmed in an eternal penal doom. There must be error in a doctrine which clearly points to such possibilities" (p. 517). "If this doctrine be true the infant just born, yea, and before it is born, deserves an eternal penal doom and might be justly damned forever" (p. 518). That is: 1. The depravity itself is a punishment from God inflicted upon innocent, unborn babes! 2. The punishment is so bad, that it merits another punishment from the same God of eternal damnation of these helpless infants, whom God himself, over and over again, calls "innocent"! Thus the absurdities and horrors of this atrocious theology multiply until men are filled with amazement that theologians could ever sit down and calmly write such reflections on the goodness and government of God.

Let no one think for a moment that we are pressing this argument unduly, or overstating its importance. This question is fundamental and vital to sound theology; for, granting the natal desert of damnation of all children, then there can be no valid objection.

1. To the unconditional election of a few out of the reprobate mass of universal humanity;
 2. To the limited atonement made only for the elect.
 3. To irresistible, efficacious grace which forcibly secures the salvation of the chosen few.
 4. To the reprobation of all the rest to an unavoidable damnation.
 5. To the final perseverance which inevitably brings to eternal salvation the predestinated number.
- "Methodism clearly perceives that to admit that mankind are actually born into the world justly under condemnation is to grant the foundation of the whole Calvinistic scheme" (Summers: Systematic Theology, Vol. II, p. 38).

"An actual sin with the desert of punishment in the sinner, is clearly open to the cognizance of the average mind, but the sinful-ness of a mere nature, with the desert of punishment, is hidden in obscurity. Its utter unintelligibility disproves its reality" (Miley, Vol. I, p. 519). In this he agrees perfectly with Finney and Fairchild and Dr. Taylor of Yale. "It is an easy and plausible thing" observes Watson, "to say in the usual loose and general manner of stating the sublapsarian doctrine, that the whole race having fallen in Adam, and become justly liable to death, God might, without any impeachment of his justice, in the exercise of his sovereign grace, appoint some to life and salvation by Christ, and leave the others to their deserved punishment." But this is a false view of the case, built upon the false assumption that the whole race were personally and individually, in consequence of Adam's fall, absolutely liable to eternal death. It is easy to be refuted on the clear authority of Scripture. 'Sin is the transgression of the law,' and in no other light is it represented in Scripture, when eternal death is threatened as its penalty, than as an act of a rational being, sinning against a law, known or knowable, and as an act, avoidable and not forced or necessary (Institutes, Vol. II, pp. 394, 395)

This is the only logical position of Arminianism, viz., to hold firmly to the doctrine of native depravity but to reject the idea of native demerit. "Freedom is to Arminianism what sovereignty is to Calvinism. In Arminianism, freedom must include the power of choosing, the good as the necessary ground of a responsible probation. Repentance and faith as requisite to salvation must be possible; punishable deeds must possibly be avoidable; responsible duties must be practicable. This is the meaning of Arminianism in the maintenance of a universal grace through a universal atonement; a grace which lifts up mankind into freedom with power to choose the good. Such freedom is the condition of moral responsibility; and without it we could be neither sinful nor punishable, because our moral life could not proceed from our own personal agency. This is the doctrine of Arminianism, always and everywhere firmly maintained. But if we could not be sinful and punishable in our actual life without free personal agency, or through morally necessitated evil deeds, how can we be sinful and punishable through the sin of Adam, or on the ground of an inherited corruption of nature?" (Miley, Vol. I, p. 522).

JOHN WESLEY plainly saw this. In 1784 he prepared and sent over by Bishop Coke a set of articles for the American "Methodists then to be organized into a Church. He rewrote the Ninth Article of the Church of England, making the Seventh Article of the Methodist Church. In doing it he left out the word "fault," and the words: "So that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the Spirit, and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation." Thus Wesley eliminated at a stroke this idea of the penal desert of depravity from Methodist theology. Whedon observes: "Wesley rejects the doctrine of our personal desert of damnation here affirmed, for the very good reason that it contradicts our intuitive sense of right and justice. That rejection removes a contradiction to the moral sense and to common sense from theology" (Miley, Vol. I, pp. 524, 525).

The following important truths shine out upon us from the elaborate discussion.

1. Sin can never be defined as the guilt of an inherited nature. "A mere nature cannot be the subject of guilt. No more can it be sinful in the sense of penal desert. Only a person can be the subject of guilt; and a person can be a responsible sinner only through his own agency. There can be no true definition of sin which omits a responsible personal agency" (Miley, p. 527).
2. God's law lays no demands upon human nature, simply as such, but only on persons.
3. We are only responsible for the continuance of depravity after we learn of its remedy. "While not responsible for the corruption of our nature by genetic transmission, yet, with the grace of purification freely offered and at hand, we are justly responsible for its continuance" (Miley). This means that it is the duty of every intelligent Christian to be sanctified.
4. We reach in this discussion some practical definitions of sin, (actual sin for which we are blameworthy). (1) Arminius gives a good definition of sin. "Something thought, spoken, or done against the law of God; or the omission of something which has been commanded, by that law to be thought, spoken or done." (2) Wesley defines sin as "a voluntary transgression of a known law." (3), Miley defines thus: "Sin is disobedience to a law of God, conditioned on free-moral agency and opportunity of knowing the law. The specified free agency and opportunity of knowing the law are necessary conditions of moral responsibility and therefore the necessary conditions of sin.

NATIVE DEMERIT EXCLUDES EVERY ELEMENT OF THE TRUE DEFINITION. THEREFORE NATIVE DEPRAVITY CAN NOT BE SIN IN THE SENSE OF PENAL DESERT." Dr. Samuel Harris of Yale: "Sin is the gratification of desire against the protest of right reason."

5. Nor is moral depravity any the less a state of moral ruin. It unfits for heaven. We cannot get rid of it by our own endeavor. Only the healing cleansing grace of heaven can fit us for glory.

III. THE STATE OF INFANTS.

It is now proper to ask-what is the state of infants as they come into the World, and if they die how are they saved? Or, are they saved at all? A Calvinistic Creed lying before us tenderly consigns all but the "elect" to hell as follows: "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ, who worketh when and where and how he pleaseth; so also are all other elect persons, who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word." "Others not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the Word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet not being effectually drawn by the Father, they neither do nor can come unto Christ and therefore cannot be saved." The clerk of the Church of which we were pastor heard a Calvinistic preacher say at the funeral of a babe: "No doubt this infant is at this moment a writhing little viper in hell!" How comforting such ministrations must have been to the bereaved parents!

On the other hand, three months ago we heard a Methodist Bishop say, when baptizing a babe: "This babe has a right to be baptized, for it was born regenerated." Dr. Godbey goes farther still. He said in the Revivalist (Jan. 13, 1910): "The wonderful redeeming grace of Christ reaches every human being the moment soul and body are united in the prenatal state and thus constitute personality. Therefore, every one born into this world is born a Christian. At the same time everyone is born with the inherited depravity, or the carnal nature dwelling in them."

In his Theology, Dr. Godbey says: "The prenatal justification and regeneration constitute the normal redemption of every soul, verifying the consolatory fact that every human being, through the wonderful and stupendous grace of God in Christ, is actually born in the kingdom, and only gets out by overt transgression" (p. 217). "Conversion does not include justification and sanctification, because the child already had these works of grace, having, received them in the prenatal state" (p. 225). No scripture is given for these statements, and we doubt if there is any.

Other great sections of the Christian Church teach that infants are regenerated by baptism. This is the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church and of most churches that came directly from it. Where lies the truth among these conflicting opinions? If the doctrine of baptismal regeneration be true, the unbaptized babes, dying in infancy would be lost.

"Augustine's doctrine of native sin carried with it, of course, the damnation of infants. This consequence was felt to be horrible. Augustine himself was appalled. No wonder that he cried to Jerome for help in this awful perplexity. There could be no rest. All the better feelings of pious souls cried out for relief. There were no eyes to see the assured blessedness of dying infants in the free grace of a universal atonement. Relief was sought in the sacrament of baptism. Baptism must have power to wash away sin- must have because of the exigency of infant salvation. Baptism thus

became a saving ordinance and, naturally enough very soon for adult sinners as well as for dying infants. So one false doctrine led to another which has been of infinite detriment to the spiritual life of the Church. But if the sacraments are saving we must have a priesthood for their proper administration. Sacerdotalism is the result. Sacerdotalism, like baptismal regeneration has been a calamity to the Christian life. By a legitimate consequence, Augustine's exaggerated doctrine of native sin, greatly strengthened and intensified both, and sent them down the centuries as a fearful heritage of evil. Moral paralysis and despair were in his doctrine. Within the moral and religious sphere, man was absolutely helpless; a mass of sin and perdition, with power only to sin, and under the absolute necessity of sinning. In the utter blackness and darkness of the doctrine no eyes could see the universal grace of a universal atonement" (Miley, Vol. I, p. 532). We all have reason to thank God that a kindlier and saner theology has come to the world.

Some one asks: "But if the infant is irresponsible, how can Christ be to him a pardoner of sin and a Saviour? Probably Dr. Miley voices the best Methodist thought when he answers thus: "Christ still stands a Saviour to the infant as we hold, in the following respects:

1. Had not Christ been given, the race, in all probability, would not have been permitted to be propagated after the fall. So the grace of God underlies the very existence of every human being that is born.
2. Between the infant descendant of fallen Adam and God there is a contrariety of moral nature, by which the former is irresponsibly, and in undeveloped condition, averse to the latter, and so displacent to him. By Christ, the Mediator, that averseness is regeneratively removed, and the divine complacency restored; so that the race is enabled to persist under the divine grace. I
3. Christ, in case of infant death, entirely removes this sinful nature, so as to harmonize the being with the holiness of heaven.
4. Christ is the infants' justifier against every accuser, whether devils, evil men, or mistaken theologians; asserting their claim through his merits, in spite of their fallen lineage, to redemption and heaven. Being thus purified, justified and glorified by Christ, none are more truly qualified to join in the song of Moses and the Lamb" (Vol. I, p. 530).

IV. THEOLOGICAL INCONSISTENCIES OF METHODIST WRITERS.

In an appendix to his Second Volume, Miley, the keenest minded and most astute logician of them all, points out the logical inconsistency of many Arminian and Methodist writers. They sometimes wrote carelessly, after the Calvinistic fashion of their day, using phrases inconsistent with the basic principles of their own theology, which Calvinists clearly saw, and were quick to make use of. It all turned on this question of the connection of the race with Adamic sin. ARMINIUS, after speaking of the sin of Adam and Eve, proceeds: "The whole of this sin, however, is not peculiar to our first parents, but is common to the entire race and to all their posterity."

Wesley, arguing against Taylor, once wrote: "If no other was justly punishable, then no other was punished for that transgression But all were punished for that transgression, namely, with death. Therefore all were justly punishable for it." "And, since it is so plain that all men are actually

punished for Adam's sin, it must needs follow that they 'all sinned in Adam' " (Works, Vol. V, p. 526). FLETCHER holds the common guilt of the race through a participation in the Sin of Adam. This appears in his doctrine of infant-justification through the grace of the atonement. This grace is universal and the justification unconditional. But the justification is 'the cancellation of sin in the sense of demerit or guilt and therefore implies such form of native sin.

MR. WATSON, says Miley, held to the present Calvinistic theory of Adamic representation. He says of infants, "The fact of their being born liable to death, a part of the penalty, is sufficient to show that they were born under the whole malediction (Vol. II, p. 58). POPE says: "But when St. Paul establishes the connection between sin and death, as its comprehensive penalty, he teaches that the condemnation of the first sin reigns over all mankind, as in some sense one with Adam" (Vol. II, p. 48). "Dr. Pope holds the intrinsic sinfulness of the corruption of nature with which we are born" (Miley). "Dr. Pope maintains a free justification in Christ which fully covers the Adamic sin of the race. "The condemnation resting upon the race as such is removed by the virtue of the one oblation beginning with the beginning of sin" (p. 59).

Let it be understood that all these writers held that the atonement of Christ covered all the guilt of original sin and all came into the world justified from it. But Miley points out that they admitted too much and put themselves in a false and untenable position. Unless the infants somehow sinned in Adam, or their depravity brought penal desert why did they need to be justified? What were they to be pardoned for? or justified from? Miley well says: "If we agree with the Calvinist on the consequence of the Adamic, connection of the race, that all are thereby constituted sinners in the sense of punitive desert, there is where we ought to meet the issue. But our theologians refuse to do this, but interpose a common justification in Christ, and on this ground dispute the Calvinistic position. The real issue is thus avoided. There are here three closely connected questions. (1) The consequence of Adam's sin to the race. (2) The manner in which God has actually dealt with the race, as involved in that consequence; (3) and the manner in which he might justly have dealt with it.

"We have seen the substantial agreement of many Arminian and Calvinistic writers on the first question. There is a wide difference on the second question. With the Calvinist, God dealt with the sinful race in the mode of election and reprobation-redeeming a part of mankind; with the Arminian in the mode of a universal atonement. In this issue the truth is surely with the Arminian. But this gives him no legal right to shun the third question-the manner in which God might have dealt with the race.

The Calvinist asserts that, as by the sin of Adam all men deserve an eternal penal doom, God might justly exclude a part from the grace of redemption. If we hold the Adamic sinfulness in which that position is grounded, we must meet the issue at this point. To answer that God has not so dealt with the race is to evade the question.

There is no escape in this mode. The doctrine of a common Adamic sin with the desert of an eternal penal doom, binds us to its logical implications. To say that God could not justly inflict this penalty on all mankind is to impeach his justice in holding us guilty for the sin of Adam. If the universal execution of the penalty would be unjust, the universal sentence of condemnation would be unjust.

"The doctrine maintained in the quotations from Arminian writers means that the offspring of Adam simply on account of his sin, and without any personal fault of their own, might justly be doomed to an eternal penal death. It means that, previous to the common justification in Christ, all are under this condemnation and might justly suffer the infliction of this penal doom. John Fletcher said: "Calvinists are now ashamed of consigning infants to the torments of hell; they begin to extend their election to them all." Yet Fletcher himself maintained a doctrine of original sin which means the desert of such a doom; and many Arminians in his succession have done the same. If the infliction of such a doom would deeply offend one's sensibilities, why should not the doctrine of its just desert equally offend one's moral reason? IF CALVINISTS ARE ASHAMED OF THE DOCTRINE OF INFANT DAMNATION, IT SEEMS QUITE TIME THAT ARMINIANS WERE ASHAMED OF THE DOCTRINE OF A UNIVERSAL INFANT DESERT OF DAMNATION."

Amen! Miley has the keenest, clearest moral intuition of them all, and the surest-footed logic. He sees clearly that we can not agree with Calvinists on the consequences of Adam's sin without going with them the whole way. It is like a break in the levee; the whole Mississippi will pour through. The way to travel with a Calvinist through his special doctrines is to stop just before you start. Deny his first premise and everything that follows.

When we first began to critically examine this subject we were amazed at the admission of many Methodist writers. We were held true to the faith by what we were taught at Yale, until we studied Miley, who drank at the fountain. Some things are infallibly true. No just penalty needs vindication. If infant guilt be true there is no injustice on the part of God in sending them to hell. "The denial by Methodists of the propagation of the race, except under an economy of universal redemption, is a part of the argument to clear the divine justice of all reason of impeachment in the matter of original sin. There can be no reason for this defense, except with the consent that original sin, with its penalty is in itself an injustice." "If the penalties of original sin are in themselves consistent with the divine justice, no compensatory provision is needed for their vindication; if inconsistent, no such provision can justify them" (Miley, Vol. II, p. 251).

The logical conclusion is that there is no original sin that brings penalty upon infants. All the sufferings and depravity that come to them are a misfortune and not a penalty. And all these misfortunes are more than compensated by the blessings that come through Christ. Punishment without responsibility, offends the moral reason of mankind, and is a wicked reflection on the goodness and justice of God.

The Revising Committee of the Presbyterian Church in 1902 reported as follows: "We believe that our first parents, being tempted, chose evil, and so fell away from God, and came under the power of sin, the penalty of which is eternal death; and we confess that by reason of this disobedience we and all men are born with a sinful nature (?) that we have broken God's law, and that no man can be saved but by His grace." Notice, "all realism and sinning in Adam," all "federal headship representation," all "imputation of Adam's sin" and all "guilt and damnation of infants" is left out. It is too big a load even for Calvinists to carry- at least in public.

* * * * *

END OF VOLUME I